

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXIII, No. 9.

SEPTEMBER 1943

SOME CURIOSITIES IN MEDIAEVAL MANUSCRIPTS

TO disfigure a book—even one of your own—is a crime. But to write in historical details about the author or owner of a book may provoke the gratitude of at least remote posterity. "At the Beginnings and Ends of several MS. Volumes," says Casley (Preface to his *Catalogue of the MSS. in the King's Library*, 1734),¹ "are remarkable Observations; which I have not failed to transcribe into the Catalogue, as often as they occurred: and which are often more curious than the Books themselves where they are found." Similar "curiosities" are to be found in most MSS. And while many of them have little more than an antiquarian interest, yet others are of very real value. For example, a note in the MS. li.2.11 of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, preserved in Cambridge University Library, says that "Leofric, Bishop of the Church of St. Peter presented this volume for the use of his successors"; knowing as we do that this Leofric was Bishop of Devon and Cornwall, 1046-73,² we have a definite *terminus ad quem* for the date of this glorious relic of early Saxon days. Nor is a later MS. note in the same volume without interest: "The book was bequeathed by the Right Reverend Father Mathewe Parker, Archbyshoppe of Canterburye to Sr. Nicholas Bacon Knight, &c., who do give the same to Universitie of Cambridge. Anno 1574."

The insertion of such entries was a common practice before the era of printing. Since that era people more often confined themselves to scrawling their name on any blank page. Sometimes a person does this again and again. I have before me a copy of Matthew's Version of the Bible in which a certain John Iremonger has scribbled his name all over the place.

But in pre-printing days books—manuscripts, that is—were precious. So much indeed was this the case that they were often "pledged" as securities. Notes to this effect frequently occur, affording, amongst other things, light on the prices then usual, also on the unscrupulous character of many book-lovers: Verily "there is nothing new under the sun"! For example:

¹ This has now been superseded by *The Catalogue of the Western MSS. in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, by Sir G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, 4 vols., folio, 1921. But even since Casley's volume appeared in 1734 these precious MSS. have suffered damage. For he has preserved at the end of a series of Theological Treatises which were once in the possession of Cranmer a note which has since disappeared:

"Liber T. Eyberhale, emptus Johanne Pye pro 27/6. Do Henrico Mosie, quondam scolari meo, si contingat eum presbyterari; aliter erit liber Domini Johannis Sory, sic quod non vendatur sed transeat inter cognatos meos, si fuerint aliqui inventi; sin autem, ab uno presbytero ad alium." Also from a sheet now missing in a copy of the Epistles of St. Jerome: "iste liber ligatus erat Oxonii in Catstreete ad instantiam domini Thomae Wybarun in S. Theologia baccalarii monachi Roffensis, anno domini 1467."

² Thorpe, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ii, p. 287.

A volume containing the Sapiential Books, Ezechiel, Daniel, and the Gospels, each with their respective glosses, belonged to the Convent of the Friars Preachers, London. At the end is a note: "Memorandum: on Monday, Sept. 8th, A.D. 1326, the 20th. year of King Edward (III) this volume was put in pledge by Master James of Spain, Canon of St. Paul's, London, in the hands of Friar William of Rochester of the Order and Convent of the Preachers, London, for the sum of 20 shillings,¹ which sum the said Friar William received on loan from the said James for work on the said Convent. The money is to be repaid within a fortnight of the coming Feast of St. Michael."

Precautions against borrowers who conveniently "forgot" to return volumes are constantly written in books. We ourselves, perhaps, did in schoolboy days write some doggerel such as "Steal not this book, for it is mine" with threats of condign punishment for the criminal. But we little thought that in so doing we were but puny imitators of the whole scholastic world of the Middle Ages, not merely of the rough-tongued students but of their dignified preceptors, even of Bishops. Here are a few examples: In a copy of St. Bernard's writings on Our Blessed Lady there is written at the beginning: "William Bedeford, Canon of Newenham, bought this book from Master Robert Ware, Executor of Master John Bryan, at the time that he was studying at Cambridge, St. Martin's day (Nov. 11) 1415. May anyone who keeps this unjustly or maliciously maltreats it, be anathema. Amen. It cost him 16 shillings and 8 pence."

When the members of a certain Community catalogued their books in A.D. 1049 they anathematized as follows any who should steal or borrow them:

"Omnis Librorum Raptor, nec Redditor horum,
Poenas suscipiat, et Manibus Hostia fiat:
Sit justus Vindex raptus, recti Deus index."
(? "judex")

Again, in a copy of the much-prized work of Alexander of Hales on the *Sentences*: "This volume, belonging to the Priory at Rochester, was given by (or ? copied by—'per') William of Reyersee" who appends the following fulmination:

"Qui servare libris ingratus nescit honorem,
Illius a manibus sit procul iste liber"

or:

"He who forgets the respect due to books is a graceless being,
May this volume never fall into the hands of such an one!"

Strong measures had at times to be taken in the case of defaulting

¹ Multiplying by ten—many would say by fifteen—this would equal at least £10 of our money.

borrowers. In Cranmer's own copy of his *Collectiones ex S. Scriptura et Patribus* there is pasted in an Order from the Privy Council, A.D. 1563, to the then Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Parker) demanding from Dr. Neveson¹ the prompt return of the book in question. If he refuses to deliver it up (as seems to have been anticipated) his study is to be searched and the volumes impounded. When at a later period it was thought desirable to acquire the said volumes for the Royal Library the then owners maintained that they were worth £100; but Bishop Beveridge and Dr. Jane, Appraisers for the King, refused to pay more than £50, at which price they secured them. The same two shrewd book-buyers also secured Roger Bacon's *Works* in two volumes for £40 instead of the £80 the owners demanded.

There is a remarkably business-like tone about the following entry at the end of a volume containing various devout treatises: "This book I had from John Fourde, and he received from me twelve sheets of parchment of the value, as I think, of two shillings. His son-in-law too received one part of the Morning Office (Matutinarum), worth 20 pence. Now, if the said son-in-law, by name William Scorche, is prepared to restore this to me or to my Assigns, he may have the above-mentioned book, in the Name of the Lord." Further on: "This book is the property of the wife of William Scorche, daughter of John Fourde of Dorchester; for it the said John Fourde owes me 18 pence." William Chaumbre, too, who figures in the following transaction, must have been a man of affairs, for the following is written in a copy of the *Decretals*: "An undertaking on the part of John Offergail, Denis Macgirr, Roger Odubail, Solomon Macbeanun, Nicholas Macbradaid, and Nicholas Syredean; they placed in the Langton Chest the sum of 6 marks, on the Vigil of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, 1368. Note that John Langport bought this book, with the *Supplement*, from the said Langton Chest by paying the said sum of 6 marks. The said book therefore remains in the hands of the owner and master . . . in pledge until the coming Feast of St. Michael. But if the owner of the volume should come before that Feast or on it, then he may have the said book by paying the 6 marks. If he does not come within the specified time the book shall remain in the hands of the said Hugh, but he will be bound to pray for the owner of the book, John Offergail, by way of paying what is over of the value of the book." On the last page of this precious volume: "An undertaking of William Chaumbre and Thomas of Hannoye who placed in the Chest of Robyry on the day of March following on the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter, A.D. 1371, the sum of 3 marks. This shall be handed over to William Chaumbre or his delegate." Most of the names seem Scotch!

But while careless borrowers might forget, they might also remember—some day. Not so thieves, collectors, and suchlike. And in those days purloiners of books must have been very numerous if we are to judge by

¹ This was presumably Dr. Stephen Nevynton, Commissary General of Canterbury in 1560, and later Vicar-General of Norwich.

the curses hurled at them. Yet perhaps it was natural to forget that "tuum" is not "meum" when books were scarce and studies had to be done by hook or by crook, whether you could afford to buy your books or not. Here are some fulminations against possible thieves; some modern schoolboy might like to use them—if he imagined any of his books worth stealing. In a copy of Thomas Walden (Netter), *Against the Wycliffites*: "Fratribus Oxoniae datur in manus Liber iste Johannem Whethamsted per patrem pecorum prothomartiris Angligenarum: Quem si quis rapiat raptim, titulumve retractet, Vel Judae laqueum furcas vel sesiat Amen." At the end "Father John Whethamstede, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Alban's, presented this volume for the use of the monks studying in Gloucester College, Oxford. And he bound under Anathema all who should either delete this mark of ownership or apply the volume to profane purposes." Again, in a volume dealing with *Fallacies in Logic*: "Master David of London, of the Church of the Blessed Mary of Merton, presented this book: anathema to anyone who abstracts it, alienates, pawns it, or lends to anyone not attached to this Church; also to anyone who cuts out or changes the above caption." Thomas Horstede, a monk of Rochester, and Precentor there, was a diligent copyist and one who was determined not to be deprived of the fruit of his labours: at the beginning of a *Biblical Concordance* he has written: "This belongs to the Priory of Rochester, and was presented by Brother Thomas of Horstede." He appends the following warning to thieves:

"Hunc qui praedantur Librum, rapiunt neque rite,
Horum tollantur de Libro Nomina Vite.
Fiat, fiat; Amen: habeant nullumque juvamen."¹

Horsted had also copied that immense volume, John Bromyard, O.P., *Summa Praedicatorum*, and at the end has written: "Orate pro Collectore"; while at the end of a copy he had made of the *Pantheologus* of Peter de Cornubia, Archdeacon of London, Horstede himself, perhaps, has scribbled the following distich:

"Hunc si quis titulum tollat, radatve dolose,
Eterne stimulum peme subeat tediose!"

This is plain speaking: hell and a weary one, for the miscreant! Once more: the same Horstede wrote in a copy he had made of the *Flores Sancti Bernardi*:

"Bernardi flores, pro Thoma, qui legis, ores.
Dic etiam, Thomas placeat, precor, ille Deo, mas.
Gloria sit Genti, flores cum corde legenti:
Tartari tollenti Titulum vel Librum rapienti."

¹ Warner and Gilson read "nec sentiat inde levamen".

Lines which might be Englished:

"You who read these *Flowers* of Bernard, pray for Thomas.
Say too: I pray that that same Thomas may prove pleasing to God.
Glory to such as read these *Flowers* from their hearts:
Hell to such as remove its title or steal this book!"

Examples such as these are numerous. At the risk of wearying the reader we will content ourselves with but one more, which is also of interest for the light it throws on the work students were intended to do when attending lectures. In a copy of the *Naturalia* of Aristotle: "This belongs to Rochester Priory, and was given by John the Prior. Anyone alienating it from the Priory or privy to its concealment when thus stolen, or fraudulently removing this inscription, incurs the penalty of Anathema repeated year by year by the Prior and the Chapter of the Convent. Henry de Reuham wrote this copy, heard lectures on the work in the Schools at Oxford, corrected the text and glossed it as he listened to the lectures." When Henry says that he "glossed" the copy he had so laboriously made we have to picture him listening to a more correct edition of the text of Aristotle as the Doctor read it out and expounded it. The corrections called for he would note in his copy, and in addition he would write—presumably in the margin of his text—the comments or "glosses" of the exponent. A student, then, had to make his own books—his tools, see that his copy was accurate, listen to the Professor and jot down his sapient remarks. No wonder books were precious and formed very acceptable legacies or gifts. And how laborious a student's life must have been!

Sometimes restitution of stolen books was made. A Breviary, once the property of St. Botolph's, London, seems to have been stolen by one Pryne, a London grocer. When Mary Tudor came to the throne Pryne presented the copy to her with the following verses which he wrote in the first volume:

"God save the most virtuous and noble Queen Mary's grace:
And send her to enjoy the Crown of England long time and space
Her enemies to confound and utterly to deface
And to follow her godly proceedings God give us grace
As every subject is bound for her grace to pray
That God may preserve her body from all dangers both night and day
God save the Queen
By me your humble and poor Orator, Ralph Pryne, Grocer of London,
wishing your Grace prosperous health."

One has a suspicion that the worthy grocer had been waiting to see which way the cat was going to jump. Would he have made this restitution had Lady Jane Grey succeeded to the throne?

On the last page of an illuminated Psalter we find written: "Baldwin

Smith, a respectable and honest man of London, and being in charge of the taxes and custom-duties, took this volume from some sailors who were carrying it into foreign parts; he presented it to Mary Queen of England, France and Ireland. Oct., 1563, the first year of her reign."

This is now known as Queen Mary's Psalter and is one of the marvels of fourteenth-century work, with its hundreds of beautiful illustrations of scenes from the Bible. It is sumptuously reproduced by Sir G. F. Warner: "Queen Mary's Psalter: Miniatures and Drawings by an English Artist of the Fourteenth Century, reproduced from Royal MS. 2.B.vii, with an Introduction, 1912." A sixteenth-century note says: "this boke was sune tyme the Erle of Rutelands, and it was his wil that it shulbe by successioun all way go to the lande of Ruteland or to him that linyally succeedis by reson of inheritaunce in the saide lande."¹ The first Earl of Rutland after the resuscitation of the Earldom was Thomas Manners, from 1525-43; his son Henry was imprisoned on the accession of Mary Tudor as being a supporter of Lady Jane Grey.

Nothing worries a priest more than to find he has mislaid his Breviary, perhaps left it in the train for the delectation of the Lost Property Officials. A short time ago a perfectly new Breviary was brought to me by a man who had picked it up in the road. He told me quite frankly that he was bitterly disappointed to find it was in "some foreign lingo". He had hoped he had secured "a jolly nice Bible on the cheap"! But whatever the faults of the clergy they do not—as a rule—steal one another's Breviaries. Yet in the Middle Ages it seems to have been otherwise. For in an exceedingly old Breviary, referred to the fifteenth century, and containing an Almanach, Psalter, Litanies, Hymns and abbreviated Lessons, there is a note at the beginning: "This belongs to St. Alban's. Anathema to anyone who steals it or defaces it! Amen." Inside the cover stands the name of John Wardur.

Even when printing had made books cheaper there were still people who tampered with titles indicating ownership; in a copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis* was printed: "This Boke appertayneth to the right honorable the Ladie Margaret Strainge"; some unscrupulous person cut this out, but the impression was so heavily made that it can still be read—backwards—on the other side of the page.

It was often difficult to decide to whom certain volumes really belonged. Who, for instance, was the rightful owner of a copy of the *Historia* by Matthew Paris in which the author himself had written: "Brother Matthew Paris presented this book to . . ."? Unfortunately, someone had scratched out the name and habitat of the recipient! John, Bishop of Lincoln, discussing the vexed question, wrote in the year 1488: "If it can be proved to be the rightful property of the exempt monastery of St. Alban in this diocese, I hereby declare that I intend to keep the volume for my own

¹ So long ago as 1865 Westlake and Purdue published *The Illustrations of Old Testament History in Queen Mary's Psalter*.

use; for I had the requisite permission from members of the community. But failing proof of that, I wish it, in accordance with the conditions agreed on when it came into my possession, to belong to the College of Blessed Mary of Winchester, in Oxford, founded by William of Wykeham, formerly Bishop of Winchester. Written with my own hand at Bukdene, June 19, 1488. John Lincoln. If anyone erases or mutilates the above statement, let him be Anathema."

In a copy of the Statutes of the Church at Hereford: "This book belongs to Master William Reed, Bishop of Chichester; he bought it from the Venerable Father Dom Thomas Trylbek, Bishop of Rochester. Therefore pray for them both." Underneath: "This book is the property of the Master and Priests of the College of the Holy Trinity at Chichester, and was the gift of Father Dom William III, Bishop of Chichester, who by Papal authority and the consent of all there present, erected this College which was founded by the noble Lord Dom Richard, Count of Arundel. Pray then for him and the benefactors of the College, and for the deliverance from Purgatory of the souls of the Faithful Departed there detained. This deponent desires the volume to be strongly chained in the said College."

Once more: at the beginning of his copy of the *Breviarium Bibliorum* by Peter de Aureolis, Philip de Repynndon, formerly Bishop of Lincoln,¹ has written: "I bestow this book, known as 'Peter de Aureolis', on the library now being reconstructed for the Church at Lincoln. But I reserve the use and possession of it to Richard Frydeby, Clerk, Canon and Prebendary of Miltown, as token of good will, for the rest of his life. On his death it is to be faithfully and promptly returned to the said library or its custodians at the time. Written with my own hand, Feb. 6, 1422."

Books, then, were precious, and the purchasing or presentation or delegation of them was a serious matter. For example: Professors and students alike needed copies of Peter Lombard on the *Sentences*, the manual of theology most in use. The owner, then, of a copy deemed it worth while to write in it: "This book of the *Sentences* is the property of Master Roger, Archdeacon of Lincoln; he bought it from Walter the Chaplain, brother of Henry, Vicar of Northelkinton, in the presence of Master Robert de Lec, of Master John of Lirling, of the Clerk, Richard de Luda, of Richard the Almoner, and of the aforesaid Henry the Vicar with his Clerk, as well as others. And the aforesaid Archdeacon presented the said volume to God, to St. Oswald, and to Abbot Peter of Bardon and to the Convent of Bardon." Again, John Smith, Professor of Astronomy at Oxford, wrote in a copy of Ptolemy's *Almagest* which he had bought at Constantinople in A.D. 1536: "This book belonged to Sultan Ahmed, the Turkish Emperour, and cost about an hundred Crownes at the first." It would be interesting to know how Smith got possession of the precious volume.

But if books were valuable, of no less value was the work of those

¹ Excommunicated for adherence to Wycliffe, he abjured his heresies, 1383; became Bishop of Lincoln, 1406; Cardinal, 1408; resigned his See, 1419; and died in 1424.

who laboriously copied them out. And these copyists, professional or otherwise, were well aware of their own importance and prided themselves on their skill. One of them writes in a complacent fashion at the end of a copy he had made of Trivet, *On the Commentaries of Seneca*: "Sum scriptor talis monstrat mea littera qualis, respondit Ellerker" or: "Says Ellerker: 'What kind of a writer I am (the beauty of) my writing shews'."

But their work must often have proved monotonous in the extreme. One of them writes at the end of his copy of that very popular book of devotion, St. Aldhelm's *De Laude Virginitatis*:

"Tres digiti scribunt, totum Corpusque laborat:
Scribere qui nescit, nullum putat esse laborem."

which may be rendered:

"Though only my three fingers write, yet my whole body toils:
Those who know not how to write, think it no labour at all!"

Unfortunately, these copyists were not always as careful as they should have been; like Homer, they often nodded, and the resulting mistakes caused confusion and recriminations on the part of the exasperated reader. Of this copyists were well aware: at the end of a copy of the *Breviarium Sententiarum* of the Lombard a copyist has written:

"Quisquis eris, Lector, ne dicas, Vac tibi, scriptor!"

Readers of the *Expositio Evangeliorum* by William of Nottingham are urged to "pray for the soul of John Leyre, Rector of the Church at Doddington, who made this copy for his own profit and for the honour of God; also for the soul of Brother William of Nottingham who with great toil compiled this Exposition from various sources." At the end the copyist has written:

"Qui me complevit, non tota nocte quievit.
Hoc Opus est factum: Scriptor tenuit bene pactum.
Non petit incaustum, sed vini nobilis haustum:
Sorte beatorum Lector Libri potiatur:
Morteque Malorum Raptor Libri moriatur. Amen, Anno Domini 1361."

or:

"The copyist who penned this laboured throughout the night.
His task is now completed; he reckons he has fulfilled his contract.
It is not ink he now wants, but a draught of generous wine!
May his readers too drink deep draughts of¹ the happiness of the Blessed;
May those who steal this book die the death of the wicked!"

The following impolite distich stands at the end of a collection of theological treatises:

¹ "Potiatur" of course means "may he obtain", but the writer is punning, "poto", "I drink", and "potior" being similar in sound.

"Sunt tria gaudia, laus, sapientia, gloria rerum.
Haec tria destruit, haec tria deluit ars mulierum."

While here, written in a fourteenth-century hand in a copy of St. Gregory's *Liber Pastoralis*, is a piece of salutary advice to students:

"Disce puer, dum tempus habes evo juvenile.
Ne doleas cum pauca scias etate senili."

A schoolboy wiles away the weary time when no master is looking by scribbling in his book. So too did some of the copyists of old. One of them, engaged in transcribing the popular *Historia Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, by Peter Comestor, amused himself by writing a punning epitaph on the author:

"Petrus eram, quem Petra tegit, dictusque Comestor:
Nunc comedor. Docui vivus: nunc cesso docere
Mortuus: ut dicat, qui me videt incineratum,
Quod sumus, iste fuit: erimus quandoque quod est."

"Peter I was called; but the True 'Petra' now shelters me.
The 'Consumer' was I named; but 'consumed' now am I.
In life I taught; now dead I have ceased to teach.
Let those who see me thus 'consumed', say:
As Peter now, so shall we one day be!"

In the margin of the first page of another copy of the same Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* is written: "Presented by Ralph Stock, monk. Anathema to anyone stealing it or concealing its theft!" And at the end: "As security, placed by Thomas Wybarn in the Chichele Chest, Aug. 20, 1468, and belongs to Master Peter. It is pledged for 25 shillings."

Considering the value set upon these manuscript volumes it must seem strange that not only those who copied them but their owners, too, thought well at times to insert on the blank sheets historical details which seemed to have no connexion with the subject matter of the volume in question. How strange, for instance, that the possessor of a MS. containing *Arguments from Scripture in Alphabetical Order* should insert an account of the foundation of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge: "In the year 902 Alfred King of the English founded the University at Oxford," with the following distich:

"Hoc studium magnum, quod regnat ad vada boum,
Ante finem saeculi regnabit ad vada Saxi."

As for Cambridge: "In the year of Our Lord 109 [sic!] the Abbot of Croyland sent to his manor of Cotungham near Cambridge, four monks: one to be professor of Holy Scripture, another to teach Grammar, a third Logic, a fourth Rhetoric. These monks laid the foundations of the University."
Vol. xxiii.

versity of Cambridge on the model of that at Paris. On the Sundays the Doctor taught the people out of the Word of God; during the week he and the others taught Theology and their respective subjects."

A copyist named Peter Meghen transcribed the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John as well as the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. These he arranged in double columns, one giving St. Jerome's version—the Vulgate, the other the version made by Erasmus. At the end of this immense and beautifully written volume he wrote: "Praise and thanksgiving to the Supreme and Undivided Trinity, to the most sweet Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and to the entire host of heaven. For by their help this volume containing the work of the two Evangelists Luke and John, was written. This was done at the bidding and at the expense of the Reverend and Venerable Lord John Collett, Dean of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London, also of Henry Collett, Knight, son of a wealthy citizen and Counsellor of London of which city he was twice Mayor. This copy was completed by the skill and industry of Peter Meghen the one-eyed (monoculi), a German, of the town Buschidich in Brabant, in the diocese of Lierre, the 7th. of September, 1509, being the first year of the Illustrious King Henry VIII."

How laborious and lengthy a task it was to transcribe all the above appears from the fact that Peter had finished copying St. Paul's Epistles three years before, in 1506. For at that point this Burgundian inserted—presumably from patriotic motives—an historical event which interested him: "In the same year, the twenty-second of Henry VII, the most noble and illustrious Prince, Philip, King of Castile, Arragon, &c., Archduke of Austria, Duke of Burgundy, Brabant, &c., being driven by storm, landed on the shores of England and was received most paternally by the King who treated him hospitably and bestowed on him many honours and gifts. In October the King went the way of all flesh. May Almighty God have mercy on his soul and on the souls of all the Faithful Departed! Amen."

One wonders, too, what induced a reader contemporary with the author to insert in the *Chronicle of Emperors and Popes* down to A.D. 1300 (by Martin Polonus, O.P.) a detailed account of the apocryphal Pope Joan:

"After Leo, succeeded John the Englishman, two years, five months and four days. When he died at Rome the Papal Chair was vacant for a month. It is asserted that this John was a woman taken in her girlhood to Athens by her lover and dressed in man's attire. At Athens she made such progress in learning that her equal could not be found. So much was this the case that when during three years she lectured at Rome with great repute, many Masters as well as students were among her auditory; her life and her reputation for learning were such that she was unanimously elected Pope. Then, however, she found she was about to become a mother through one of her servants. Through not being certain about the date when her child might be born she was unexpectedly delivered of a child when in a procession from St. Peter's to the Lateran, this happened just

between the Coliseum and St. Clement's. She died and was buried on the spot. The Pope is said always to refuse to pass that way, through—so it is said—abhorrence of what there took place. This Pope John is not enrolled in the Calendar of Saints owing to the disgrace attaching to her sex."

This explanation of her failure to secure the honour of canonization is delightfully naïve.

At the end of the list of Popes in the same Chronicle is a warning to all in high station:

"In me cognosce qui transis, quam breve posse
Est hominis, valui, dum quod es ipse fui,
Sed modo nil possum, quia tantum pulvis et os sum.
Sic tu nihil poteris, quando sepultus eris."

Another delightful entry is to be found in the British Museum copy of the very rare 16mo. edition of Coverdale's New Testament, 1538, which once belonged to Queen Elizabeth. On a blank page she has written to A. Poynts, her Maid of Honour, when making her a present of the book:

"Among good thinges
I prove and finde, the quiet
life doth muche abounde,
and sure to the contentid
mynde, ther is no riches
may be founde
Your lovinge
maistres
Elizabeth"

A Note signed "Jno. Waller" says: "The Worthy Dr. Gibbon faithfully assured me that the handwriting was really Queen Elizabeth's; and I believe it having many Letters of her writing." On the other side is a drawing by Edward VI of Windsor Castle and of a knight in his robes. A Note penned in 1768 says: "This is actually a drawing of King Edward the Sixth. I. W. May, 1768."¹

In a MS. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, S.16, a note in a later hand runs: "The Bede Boke of Darbeye (in the Peake of Darbyshire): This Booke was sumtime had in such reverence in Darbieshire that it was commonly beleved that whosoever should sweare untrelie upon this booke should run madd."²

At the end of a catalogue of the Scotch Monasteries and their foundings: "Note that every Parish Church in the greater towns such as Edinburgh is a College. This I learned from the mouth of Master John Adamson, Prefect of the College of Edinburgh, 1650."

A Commentary of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ascribed by Bale to Thomas

¹ Dore, *Old Bibles*, 2nd ed., 1888, p. 96.

² Wanley, *Catalogus Historico-Criticus Librorum Veterum Septentrionalium*, 1704, p. 149.

Walleys, O.P., but more correctly to Hopeman, has at the end: "These seem to be the collected Commentaries of Thomas Walleys who was imprisoned by Pope John XXIII. When this Pope maintained that the souls of the Blessed had no share in the clear vision of God until the last day, the said Thomas stoutly withstood him out of the Word of Christ, preferring contempt and imprisonment to yielding."

Some entries have a tragic ring, heightened by their brevity: at the end of a Bible¹: "In 1312 this volume was transcribed by Robert de Marchia, Cleric, imprisoned in Paris. From which prison may God, the Rewarder of all good works unto eternity, deign to deliver me. Amen. Te Deum laudamus . . ." Not many modern prisoners would spend their enforced leisure copying out the Bible! Yet one who had lived many years at His Majesty's expense did confide to me that he had learned a great deal of the Bible by heart. But the free version he volunteered of its more lurid passages was hardly edifying!

Another prisoner who relieved the tedium of his confinement by translating the Psalms was Sir Thomas Smith, whose version exists in manuscript: "Certaigne Psalmes or Songues of David translated into English meter by Sir Thomas Smith, Knight, then prisoner in the Tower of London. With other prayers and songues by him made to pas the tyme there, 1549." The translator had been Secretary of State to Somerset, on whose fall he was committed to the Tower.

In a copy of the *Decretals* is an entry of a sufficiently startling character: "In the Parish (Church) of St. Margaret, Westminster, London, in the year 1300, about midnight, in the presence of the many who were keeping watch, a brilliant light suddenly shone over the bier on which lay the body of a fraudulent questor for alms; the lamps too were extinguished all of a sudden, and all the ornaments as well as the body of the said fraudulent man were licked up and snatched away; meanwhile the spirits of evil shouted aloud."

Another strange historical (?) item tells how in the days of Richard II an excommunicated person who had recently died appeared in the form first of a raven and then of a dog, to a tailor of Ampleforth, by name Snowball, as he was riding home from Gilling.

One wonders what King James thought of the following request:

"A Prayer for a Buck with a Parke, or for a good Bishopricke, or for a fatte benefice at least, to the use of the leanest Vicar in Great Britain, as seemeth. A Letter of Christopher Windle to James I. In 1588 he was Minister at Bisley, Glos. and in gaol for debt."

To conclude: here is a Prayer to be recited before saying the Divine Office; it was composed by Eadwine, the copyist of the famous *Psalterium Triplex*, about A.D. 1140:

¹ This is the second volume of the French *Bible Historiale*, by Guyot des Moulins, who died between 1312 and 1320. Warner & Gilson, p. 8; cf. Berger, *Bible française*, pp. 187-8, 282-3 and 385.

"Omnipotens et misericors Deus clementiam tuam suppliciter deprecor ut me famulum tuum N. . . . tibi servire fideliter concedas et perseverantiam bonam et felicem consummationem mihi largire digneris, et hoc Psalterium, quia in conspectu tuo cantavi ad salutem et ad remedium animae meae proficiat sempiternam. Amen."

Another from among *Certaine Prayers of the Saxon times taken out of the Nines Rules of St. James' Order* (MS. in Benet (Corpus Christi) College Library):

"In Latine, to be said on receiving the Sacrament of the Altar: Concede quaesumus Omnipotens Deus, ut Quem aenigmatice et sub aliena specie cernimus, quo sacramentaliter cibamur in terris, facie ad faciem Eum Videamus, Eo sicut est veraciter et realiter frui mereamur in coelis. Per Eundem Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum. Amen."

One can almost imagine that St. Thomas Aquinas had seen this when he composed the Rhythm *Adoro Te devote*.

HUGH POPE, O.P.

THE KNIGHTS OF LABOUR¹

THIS chapter of American industrial history is worth retelling because it is the story of a pioneer labour movement brimful of interest, instruction, and warning, as well as of encouragement, for all Catholics interested in the social question.

Among the many problems raised by the American Civil War was that of dilution of skilled labour. This became particularly acute in the tailoring trade, where unskilled labour had to be called in to cope with the wartime difficulty of clothing the troops. Employers were quick to seize the chance to reduce wages to the unskilled rate, and in self-defence the skilled tailors were driven to organize to protect their standard of living. In Philadelphia the Garmentcutters' Association was set up in 1862 to establish the right to fair wages, an accepted principle today, but then proclaimed in the United States for the first time by any organized body of labour. For several years the movement flourished, until, as often happens, interest flagged and drastic changes were clearly needed if anything were to be saved from the wreck. Uriah Stephens, one of the members, complained, "There is more discussion in the cutting-rooms the day after a meeting than there is at any of the meetings. . . . The members do not seem to have any conception of what organization means. . . . The floor-walkers who are not connected with the society in any way carry every day to the counting-house all that has been done in our organization, and they pick it up by hearing our loose-mouthed members discussing it at the bench."

¹ Sources: *The Tablet*, 1887, Vol. I; *The Dublin Review*, July 1919: "Manning, America, and Democracy" (Shane Leslie); T. V. Powderly: *Thirty Years of Labour*.

By December 1869 Stephens, with the help of eight or nine other members, was ready to wind up the Garmentcutters' Association, and to replace it by a new society to be known as the Knights of Labour. It was to be a secret society, because secrecy was deemed necessary to protect members from being blacklisted by ruthless employers. This was not a new feature in labour organizations, for most of the labour unions which had a brief existence in this country a hundred years or more ago administered a secret oath, thereby rendering themselves liable to the fury of the anti-combination laws. Merely for administering an oath the Tolpuddle labourers were sentenced to seven years' transportation in 1834.

Even the name of the Knights of Labour was to remain secret; in any notices issued five stars should be enough for the initiated to recognize the source of any instruction. An elaborate ritual was drawn up for initiation, borrowed largely by Stephens, himself a Mason, from the Masonic ritual. Greek literature was ransacked to provide apt quotations, and the motto of the Order, "That is the most perfect government in which an injury to one is the concern of all", came from the great law-giver Solon.

The charter of the Order was delivered orally to each member at his initiation, and was neither written nor printed until later secrecy was abolished. Its instructions are evidence of a lofty appreciation of the dignity of labour, and they breathe a moderation which makes us forget that these were the palmy days of Karl Marx.

Labour is noble and holy; to defend it from degradation, to divest it of the evils to body, mind, estate, which ignorance and the greed of man have fastened on it, and to rescue the toiler from the grasp of the selfish, is a work worthy of the noblest and best of our race. We do not intend to create antagonism against necessary capital, no conflict with legitimate enterprise is ours. We mean to uphold the dignity of labour, and to affirm the nobility of all who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. We intend to work for the creation of a healthy public opinion on the subject of labour—the only creator of values—and to advocate the justice of its receiving a full complete share of the values it creates. We shall lend all our strength to support all laws made to harmonize labour and capital, or that tend to lighten the exhaustiveness of toil. To attend to his work, to look to his interests, to acquire knowledge of the world of trade, to unite, to organize, co-operate with the great army of peace and industry, to foster and tend, to raise and develop the temple in which he dwells, such is the highest and noblest duty of man towards his fellow men and towards his Creator.

Such were the ideals of the Knights of Labour, and in view of later criticisms it were well to bear them in mind. They certainly do credit to Stephens, and with the exception of the Marxian fallacy that labour is the sole creator of values, relegated to a parenthesis, they constitute a statement of principles worthy of the author of "The Condition of the Working Classes".

Secrecy was meant to be a protection, but it was so rigid that it became a fatal handicap to the spread of the movement. Stephens was obsessed by the helplessness of labour against the combined might of capitalism, which was always able to present a united front. The weakness of labour lay in its dispersal over a multitude of unions. His aim was therefore to make the

Knights a combined union of "all branches of honourable toil". He had in mind a movement like the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union of Great Britain and Ireland, started in 1834, but doomed to an early end by its very unwieldiness.

It is not surprising that after one year the Knights numbered only seventy-five fully initiated members, and that after ten years the millennium was as far off as ever with no more than ten thousand members. Even among this small number disunion was rife, and soon played such havoc that the movement seemed in no better shape than the earlier Garment-cutters' Union. Several local and district assemblies did in fact break away for a time, not so much on account of industrial troubles as because of its secrecy and Masonic ritual, which were disliked by the many Catholics who had already become members of the Order. In 1878, to save the movement and to appease Catholic antagonism, Stephens decided to make its nature and aims public. The next year he was succeeded as Grand Master Workman or President by Terence V. Powderly, a Catholic, under whose leadership began an era of expansion which has made the Knights of Labour famous in industrial history.

Powderly was a machinist or mechanic by trade, a member of the Machinists' and Blacksmiths' Union, when he first heard of the Knights of Labour at the second and last annual meeting of the Industrial Congress of the United States, another short-lived movement, in 1874. He was duly initiated, but it took him two years to find out the whereabouts of the Order, to be attached to a local assembly, and finally to become its Master Workman. His own experience was therefore calculated to set him against a secrecy which would be fatal to any organized movement. He was marked out for leadership, masterly in his exposition of American social problems and labour's solutions, an apostle of enlightened citizenship, fair in his attitude to the capitalist opposition, and ruthless in striving to suppress wreckers in his own movement.

His first task as President was to revise the constitution of the Knights, and to widen the basis of membership. To him "all branches of honourable toil" meant more than to Stephens, and included not merely skilled trades, but unskilled trades as well, employers, women, and even negroes. Doctors were eligible, but the line was drawn at lawyers and publicans. The former he regarded as corrupt and political place-hunters; the latter, the saloon keepers, were the great obstacle to a sober working class.

During the next six years the Knights of Labour enjoyed their share of the progress made by the labour movement. The Press had come to recognize them as a power, and, in pursuance of a policy which still obtains, chronicled their doings with such goodwill and exaggeration that it was not a little responsible for their increase. So numerous were the applications for admission in 1885 that for a time membership was closed. Next year Powderly told a Government Committee, "We have not more than 100,000 members, though we are said to have fifty millions." Congress

now called leaders into consultation on labour questions, and they could boast the sympathy of the American hierarchy.

In the revised constitution this generation may see nothing extraordinary, but considered in the light of sixty years ago it will be found both interesting and instructive, and may provide the solution to the problem of its later delation to the Holy See. To the Knights the focus of the antagonism between capital and labour was the wage system, but they were realistic enough to understand that this could be remedied only by a slow process of social evolution, so they concentrated on reforms of a more directly practical nature.

They demanded, among other things, the equality of capital and labour before the law, workmen's compensation, the substitution of voluntary arbitration for strikes, an eight-hour working day, the prohibition of child labour, equal pay for equal work, graduated income tax, nationalization of railroads and telegraphs, and the establishment of co-operative institutions both productive and distributive. Their land policy followed the agrarian socialism of Henry George, which just then was rather fashionable.

Great stress was laid on the urgent need for education along civic and industrial lines if the working man was to work effectively for economic freedom. Knowledge must be the starting-point for action, and a sense of social duty must be developed. Politics were banned; official support of any political party was steadfastly refused. The strike as an economic weapon was of doubtful value, to be resorted to only in extreme cases because it tended to perpetuate class wars, and could have no bearing on the final issue, the abolition of the wage system. Constitutional agitation was necessary, but most needed was education to bring about a revolution in the world of ideas.

Later one of the charges brought against the Knights was their apparently reckless indulgence in strikes. In the years following 1884 the number of strikes in U.S.A. was more than doubled, and it is generally recognized that the greater part were the work of the Knights. In 1885, when the Order scored its greatest success in the New York Street Railways Strike, there were 645 strikes as against 471 in 1881, while in 1886 the number rose to 1,432, and remained high for years afterwards. Formerly they had been almost always a failure, but now about 40 per cent were successful.

The Knights did not actually change their policy, but they were often implicated in defiance of the constitutions and the wishes of their leaders, who were unable to control the actions of local bodies, just as they were helpless to prevent individual acts of sabotage. This was unfortunate, but can be explained by the too rapid increase of the Order, and a consequent inability to secure recognition of, and respect for, the constitutions. Powderly realized that he had two enemies to face, anarchy and monopoly. Anarchy was the more formidable, because it was inside his own movement, and was due to a Communist minority which even then showed itself to be the wrecker we are now more familiar with. There was proof that some capitalists were subsidizing Communists to become Knights, the

better to throw discredit on the whole Order. He refused any quarter to the wreckers, or to withdraw one step from the position he had taken up, even when in some areas this meant an almost total loss of members.

In Canada disaster had already befallen the Knights, due largely to the destructive tactics employed. In 1884 pressure had been brought to bear on the Archbishop of Quebec, Cardinal Taschereau, who finally referred the matter of the Knights to the Holy See. The result was a condemnation "*localiter et juxta exposita*", chiefly on the plea of their being a secret society, so that on the evidence advanced no Catholic in Canada could continue to be a member. This condemnation strengthened the hands of their enemies in the United States, who seized on the pretext of the many strikes, the numerous acts of violence, and the alarming growth of Communist activity, to make representations to Rome to have the condemnation extended to their own country. Reports were next circulated that the Holy See had actually drawn up the desired condemnation, and merely awaited an opportunity to publish it.

In this crisis Powderly conferred with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, who in turn consulted President Cleveland and Cardinal Manning. October 1886 found a committee of Archbishops sitting to thrash out the whole question. Ten of the twelve Archbishops voted against condemnation, and it was known that of the entire American hierarchy of seventy-five bishops seventy were favourable to the Order on the grounds that condemnation could serve no good purpose, and would gravely injure the interests of the Church in the United States. To reverse the decision of the Holy See prompt action was demanded, and to Cardinal Gibbons was given the duty of conveying the views of the American hierarchy to Rome.

He set sail for Europe with Cardinal Taschereau, whose mission was to uphold the condemnation in Canada, and once outside the United States his only support was Cardinal Manning. In Rome the day seemed already lost, and Cardinal Gibbons signed his famous letter to Propaganda, convinced that "he had compromised his Cardinalial status".

He readily admits that the American hierarchy do not approve everything in the constitution, laws, and official declarations of the Knights of Labour, but at the same time fails to find those elements which would bring them under the heading of condemned associations, since the form of initiation contains no oath, no promise of blind obedience, and no obligation to secrecy repugnant to Catholic teaching. Far from professing hostility to Church or State, the Knights are particularly amenable, and are anxious to remove any objectionable features. The evils they are fighting are beyond dispute, and neither religious confraternities nor purely Catholic labour organizations could meet the case. In a mixed community mixed associations are inevitable, and to the objection that Catholics may fall into the hands of extremists the reply is that the extremists are already routed, and that the Knights are now rather a Catholic body to which non-Catholics are admitted.

The Cardinal does not underestimate the danger from Communism. "It is objected that in such organizations Catholics are exposed to the evil influences of the most dangerous associates, even of atheists, Communists, and anarchists. This is true, but it is one of those trials of faith which our brave American Catholics are accustomed to meet almost daily, and which they know how to face with good sense and firmness. The Press of our country tells us, and the president of the Knights has related to us, how these violent aggressive elements have endeavoured to control the association, or to inject poison into its principles; but they also inform us with what determination these machinators have been repulsed and beaten."

Strikes, he points out, are neither the invention nor the monopoly of the Knights, and he exonerates them from the charge of violence and bloodshed by showing how their laws are calculated to keep strikes within the bounds of good order and lawful action. In such struggles outbursts of anger and violence are as inevitable as they are regrettable, but individual excesses ought not to be attributed to the whole Order. To do this would be "as unreasonable as to attribute to the Church the follies of her children against which she strives and protests".

Turning to the future, he writes:

"To lose influence over the people would be to lose the future altogether," and if from whatever motive the Church in America does not act on the side of humanity, she stands to lose her glorious title of Friend of the Poor, and with it the universal respect of the American people, and the tolerance of their political leaders. But the greatest danger is lest she lose the love of her children by forcing them into an attitude of resistance, because they believe they are only seeking justice by lawful means, and they would consider a condemnation both false and unjust, and therefore not binding. "We might preach to them submission and confidence in the Church's judgement, but these good dispositions could hardly go so far. They love the Church, and they wish to save their souls, but they must also earn their living, and labour is so organized now that without belonging to the organization it is almost impossible to earn one's living."

Finally even though condemnation were just and prudent, it is quite unnecessary under the circumstances, because such organizations as this are necessarily of an unstable and transient character, and do not last many years. Hence it does not seem fitting to level a solemn condemnation of the Church against so evanescent an object as the Order in question.

The effect of this memorial may be gathered from a letter written three weeks later to Cardinal Manning by Bishop Keane, who had accompanied Cardinal Gibbons to Rome.

It was easy to see that in his (Gibbons') words they felt the weight of the whole hierarchy, the whole clergy, and the whole people of America, and that his sentiments had produced in them a change of front. A few weeks ago the drift was towards condemnation, regardless of the widespread disastrous consequences that would have inevitably ensued. Today the keynote was that the convictions of the bishops of America are the safest guide of the Holy See in its action on American affairs.

Cardinal Manning also wrote in the same strain:

I hope it will open a new field of thought and action. It passes my understanding that officious persons should be listened to rather than official. Surely the episcopate of the whole world is the most powerful and direct instrument in the hands of the Holy

See for gathering correct local knowledge and enforcing its decisions. . . . Never at any time has the episcopate been so detached from civil powers, and so united in itself and with the Holy See. Failure to see and use these powers will breed both trouble and mischief. The Cardinal's argument is irresistible.

No condemnation was therefore issued for the United States, and the changed attitude became quite clear when the condemnation for Canada was revoked "until further orders". Cardinal Taschereau returned to Quebec, and in a circular letter ordered all members of the Knights to be readmitted to the sacraments under the usual conditions. With this reversal of policy the success of Cardinal Gibbons was complete.

In a letter to Cardinal Manning he wrote:

I cannot sufficiently express to you how much I felt strengthened in my position by being able to refer in the document to your utterances on the claims of the working-man to our sympathy, and how I am cheered beyond measure in receiving from your own pen an endorsement of my sentiments and those of my American colleagues now in Rome. . . . We are indebted more than you are aware to the influence of your name in discussing these social questions and in influencing the public mind. We joyfully adopt your Eminence into the ranks of our Knighthood; you have nobly won your spurs.

The victory still remains complete even after due weight is given to the warning of Archbishop Ireland, which helps to put the matter in its true perspective: "The Holy Father has not approved the Order of the Knights of Labour, he has only not condemned it. It will depend on the Knights themselves whether they are condemned or not."

The Order never was condemned, for, as was duly emphasized in its defence, it was transient, and the year of its vindication proved to be the eve of its decline, a decline largely attributable to its reckless indulgence in strikes, which alienated public opinion. After 1887 membership fell rapidly, and was not offset by expansion outside the American continent. There was a foundation at Charleroi, in Belgium, about 1888, a district assembly in Glasgow in 1889, another in Sheffield in 1890, as well as developments in Australia and New Zealand. By this time the American Federation of Labour, which favoured organization of workers on craft lines, was well in its stride, and by 1900 the Knights had sunk to 130,000, statistics ceasing altogether some time before 1910. Just when Powderly gave up his presidency is not clear, but it was probably about 1897, when he was appointed to the important post of Commissioner of Immigration under President McKinley's administration.

J BENNETT.

SUNDAY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

THE Cadet Services are grouping and training the youth of the country to take their share efficiently in the necessary war effort. This is all to the good, but the movement has its dangers in tending to draw away the youth of the country from the salutary influence of the Church

and the healthy home during its most impressionable years. Hence, there is more need than ever, today, of a vigorous revival of the Sunday Christian Doctrine for young people in all parishes.

In smaller country parishes the problem is perhaps not so difficult; but in the larger ones it is very formidable. Youths and children of these days do not take very kindly to the mild discipline of the Sunday School conducted by the members of the Christian Doctrine Confraternity. The older and more traditional methods outlined by Bishop Dupanloup, or contained in the two excellent works, *The Method of St. Sulpice* and Spirago's *Method of Christian Doctrine*, succeeded eminently in the past, and with some little readjustment could succeed at the present time; though, of course, the disciplinary systems recommended in these works would be overpowering for the enervated, wayward, and picture-fed young people of today.

This work and duty of indoctrinating the young is primarily a pastoral duty of the Church and cannot be wholly left to the school authorities, nor can the Sunday School be ignored as a back number, entirely out of date. Nor is it true that the Sunday School is, either in name or in fact, a Protestant institution: "It is commonly claimed that the modern Sunday School owes its origin to Robert Raikes, the English printer, who established his first Sunday School at Gloucester in 1780. But the honour belongs to St. John de la Salle, who opened his 'Ecole Dominicale' at Paris in 1699."¹

No doubt the term "Sunday School" originated in this way from Catholic sources, but the institution had been a thriving practice in the Church long before the time of St. John de la Salle. Several synods long before the Reformation, in France, Hungary and Italy, ordained that on Sundays and Feastdays parents should bring their children from seven to fourteen years old to church, in order to be instructed in the Faith.

From the beginning, the Church has always regarded the doctrinal training and instruction of the young as one of her own immediate and primary duties. There was, however, a vigorous revival of this apostolate at the time of the Reformation, when Luther drew up his first catechism to win over the young. The Council of Trent gave the word of command in this crucial ordinance: "Bishops should take care that at least on Sundays and Festivals, the children in every parish be taught by proper persons the elements of the Faith, and obedience to God and to their parents."² There was a great response in the Catholic world to this injunction, and Luther's efforts were countered by St. Peter Canisius, who won his greatest victories for the Faith by means of his catechisms. As a theologian he had devoted his energies to the salvation of the Catholic universities and schools of higher studies in central Europe from the taint of Protestantism; but he turned with equal zeal to the catechetical instruction of

¹ Cf. Spirago's *Method of Christian Doctrine*, edited in U.S.A. by Mgr. Messmer; editor's Preface, p. 9.

² Sess.: XXIV, *De Reformat.*

youth, organizing Sunday Classes and groups for young people of all ages.

"St. Peter had now made provision for the two extremes of youth, small children and students on the threshold of manhood. There remained a third class to be considered, boys and girls attending middle schools. These formed in many ways the most important class of all, the most easily moulded for good or evil, and Peter accordingly devoted very special attention to his smaller catechism, which was intended for their instruction."¹

As early as May 1557 there was a formal notice of a Sunday Christian Doctrine class programme, published at that time for the Jesuit college at Cologne. This notice orders the pupils of the higher classes to attend instruction on the larger catechism of Canisius every Sunday afternoon at four o'clock, while every Saturday afternoon at the same time the lower classes had to learn the smaller catechism of the same author. Outside the school hours, the Sunday School was being revived and reorganized to meet the new dangers of the Reformation. The Tridentine declarations were having their salutary effect, and in Rome a Milanese nobleman, Marco de Sadis-Cusani, gathered round him a band of zealous associates and well-trained catechists to assist the clergy in the work of instructing the young on the Sundays and Holydays. St. Philip Neri and his followers also gave themselves to this apostolate, and Baronius, the Oratorian, had already devoted much time to the Christian education of the young before he became the eminent Cardinal. Pope Pius IV, the reigning Pontiff, encouraged this work, and the new Association of the Christian Doctrine rapidly increased under the direction of Marco Cusani. It consisted of priests and pious laymen; the former living in community, the latter living in the world and forming what is now known as the Confraternity of the Christian Doctrine.

St. Pius V in a Bull *Ex Debito Nobis*, 6 October, 1571, ordered that similar associations should be formed by parish priests generally, and granted special indulgences to their members.

The three great Saint-Bishops, St. Francis de Sales, St. Charles Borromeo and St. Robert Bellarmine, introduced the confraternity into their own dioceses and the movement spread rapidly in other countries. It was Pope Paul V who raised it to the rank of an Archconfraternity by a Bull *Credito Nobis* in 1607, and gave it St. Peter's, Rome, as a centre. He also granted it many indulgences with the right of communicating the same to other confraternities associated with it and legitimately erected in parishes by the bishop of the diocese (can. 711).

According to the Code of Canon Law, this Confraternity, along with the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, has the special support and authorization of the Church and must be immediately under ecclesiastical direction. Therefore the Christian Doctrine of youth cannot be wholly relegated to the Schools, whether elementary or otherwise.

¹ *St. Peter Canisius*, Brodrick, S.J., Chap. vi, p. 237.

The laws regulating the direction of the Sunday Christian Doctrine or the Sunday School are to be found among those in reference to the immediate duties of pastors of souls in the catechetical instruction of the Faithful, especially of the young, on Sundays and major feasts (can. 1329-1336).

It is clear from canons 1330-1 that the young people assembled for Christian doctrine on these occasions are considered in three age-sections:

- (1) The very young, in preparation for the Sacraments of Penance, Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist.
- (2) The communicants, or youths still at school.
- (3) The adolescents, either still at school or who have left school, to whom a fuller and maturer catechetical course is to be given.

In canon 1333, §1, the clergy are recommended to enlist the services of pious layfolk to help them in this work, especially the members of the Christian Doctrine Confraternity, which has to be erected by the Bishop in every parish (can. 711, §2).

Quite a different set of ecclesiastical regulations govern and direct the religious instructions and doctrinal training to be given in colleges, convents and schools (cans. 1372-83).

It was only after the Catholic Emancipation that the movement could be developed on a large scale in England, but there must be many documents in parish archives showing that the Sunday School was a thriving institution in many places in the early decades of the nineteenth century. There is, for example, a Sunday School Rule Book at Lowe House, printed in St. Helen's in 1838.

In the first Provincial Synod of Westminster, held after the establishment of the Hierarchy in England, rectors of parishes were enjoined to establish in their churches the Confraternity of the Christian Doctrine, the members of which were to assist in the Sunday Schools. Indeed, there is hardly any period or time when ecclesiastical authorities have been silent on this matter. Pope Pius X, in his Encyclical of 15 April, 1905, by his supreme authority, strictly ordained that, "in each and every parish . . . the Confraternity of the Christian Doctrine shall be canonically erected. Through this, the parish priests . . . will have lay helpers for the catechetical instruction, in pious lay-persons, who will devote themselves to this office of teaching, moved by zeal for the glory of God."

In more recent times this vital apostolate was the main subject of the late Holy Father's Encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth, 31 December, 1929. Herein he proclaimed that the Church was the Mother and Mistress of education, and that the Church and the Catholic family constituted one and the same temple of education. He insisted, moreover, that although some doctrinal instruction was given in the school, this "does not bring it into accord with the rights of the Church and the Christian family". In referring to the grave duty of parents to send their young people to the Sunday Catechisms (cf. can. 1335) Pius XI definitely disallowed the assumption that there were many parents in any social grade who could

provide the "adequate substitute" which would excuse them from sending their children to the Christian Doctrine.

The words of the same Encyclical are vehemently emphatic on this pastoral duty: "We have therefore, two facts of supreme importance . . . : the Church placing at the disposal of families her office of mistress and educator, and the families eager to profit by the offer, and entrusting their children to the Church in hundreds and thousands. These two facts recall and proclaim a striking truth of the greatest significance in the moral and social order. They declare that the mission of education regards before all, above all, primarily the Church and the family, and this by natural and divine law, and that therefore it cannot be evaded, cannot be slighted, cannot be supplanted."

In 1935 a Decree of the Sacred Council of the Congregation, dated 12 June, enjoined the establishment in every parish of catechetical schools for children and young people, presided over by the parish priest, assisted by well-trained and competent members of the Congregation of Christian Doctrine, who are to be especially masters and mistresses of school children.¹

In the Liverpool Diocesan Synod (printed 1934) the subject of the Christian Doctrine is thus referred to on pages 34-5: "We are fully aware that religious instruction forms part of the daily curriculum of our elementary and secondary schools; we are conscious also of the fact that in this Archdiocese the regulation of giving catechetical instruction at the early Masses on Sunday is faithfully adhered to by the clergy, and that it is customary, moreover, to give further instructions to the children in the afternoon. Nevertheless, it is evident that the Church visualizes something more than this."

The practical problems that face the clergy in the larger parishes have been barely touched upon here. One difficulty is the fewness of available Catholic layfolk who have the time or the ability or even the disposition to undergo a course of necessary training for the work. If, on the other hand, this apostolate is left entirely to those who are the most capable for the work, the Catholic teachers, then young people are only too apt to regard the Sunday School as an unfair prolongation of school-hours, and as an encroachment of school sanctions into the church. This is a difficulty of no mean order, which teachers themselves realize.

The fact remains that trained teachers are the best people for this work. As a solution of the problem in these abnormal times it has been suggested by Catholic teachers that, to start with, parishioners should be selected who are teachers in other parishes. Then the youths whom they meet on the Sundays will not associate the assembly with the weekday school, but will look upon those in charge of them as the lawful representatives of their priests and parents, which, in point of fact, the members of the Christian Doctrine are.

¹ A useful summary of this Decree is given in Father Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, the later edition, Vol. IV, app. 1, p. 320.

The purpose of this article, however, will have been served if it has made clear the fact that this apostolate is of primary importance. The discussion of its many and grave problems must be left to more experienced writers.

Much useful information has been borrowed from *The Rules of the Christian Doctrine Confraternity*, published in 1907 for the Parish members by the clergy of St. Augustine's, Preston. Other instructive works include the Advent Pastoral, 1937, of his Grace the Archbishop of Birmingham, and *The Christian Doctrine Manual*, published by Sheed and Ward, with a Preface and brief history, and an Appendix by H.E. Cardinal Hinsley.

J. A. MYERSCOUGH, S.J.

THE BLESSED EUCHARIST IN MONASTIC EGYPT

THE hermits of the desert, St. Anthony not excepted, lie under a kind of suspicion in the minds of many Catholics. For all St. Anthony's boyish devotion to the Church's liturgy, from what St. Athanasius tells us of his later years we might gather that he passed long periods without receiving the Sacraments or taking any outward part in the Church's corporate life. If the ninety years of solitude with which St. Jerome credits St. Paul of Thebes be taken as historical, here is a still more serious charge. In the lack of positive indications it is difficult to answer save by saying that Christ commanded visible and outward membership of the Church, and especially reception of the Eucharist, only in general terms, which the Church herself was to define more precisely, and that in the development of centuries. But as soon as we come to that monastic movement which regarded St. Anthony as its model we are surprised by references to the Blessed Eucharist so frequent and so casual that this Sacrament is seen to have taken a place not unlike that which it holds in religious life at the present day.

The desert fathers have left us no systematic theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But the word "offering" (in Greek sources *prosphora*) is that by which the Mass is commonly known amongst them, and, just as in the Roman Pontifical, the characteristic duty of a priest is to offer (*prospherein*). The altar of their church is called a place of sacrifice (*thusiasterion*). Palladius tells us a gruesome story of two nuns who committed suicide. The priest who had charge of them commanded that for neither should the Offering be made.

Ideas about frequency of Communion in Christian and monastic Egypt were not far removed from our own. The wonder-worker St. Macarius the Egyptian had to deal with a woman diabolically transformed into a mare. Holy Water proved a remedy. He told her reproachfully that the disaster had befallen her because for long she had neglected to approach the

Mysteries. The Pachomian monks, according to the earliest and most rudimentary recension of their Rule, were given instructions for receiving Holy Communion on Saturday and Sunday. This must have been the most common practice. Of Macarius the Alexandrian we read that he made a special Communion in Lent—it was one of the five days of the year on which he anointed himself with oil—but we need not gather that it was his only Communion of the year. A Syriac recension of *Questions and Answers on the Ascetic Rule* gives us the following from the mouth of Abba Poemen: "This is what is written, 'As the hart crieth out for the water-brooks, even so crieth out my soul unto Thee, O Lord'. For the harts in the desert swallow many serpents, and when the poison of these maketh them hot within, they cry out to come to the water-brooks, but, as soon as they have drunk, the burning which cometh from the serpents inside them is cooled. And thus is it with the monks who are in the desert, for they are burnt up by the envy of evil devils, and they wait for the Saturday and Sunday that they may come to the fountain of water, that is to say to the Body of Christ, and they sweeten and purify themselves from the gall of the evil one."

The *Historia Monachorum* tells of a certain John who anticipated some saints of a later age by making the Blessed Sacrament his only food. "He never took food save on Sunday. For a priest then came to offer sacrifice for him. This alone was for him food and nourishment." The history goes on to tell how the devil came early one Sunday to supply for the regular chaplain, and was sent about his business by John with quite unmonastic language. The same history tells of a presbyter Eulogius who read the hearts of communicants, to the great embarrassment of those who approached unworthily. The historian records teaching given by the Abbot Dioscorus on the bodily purity required in the communicant. He is only a little stricter than the moral theologians of our time, very far from Jansenistic.

St. Basil visited monastic Egypt about the middle of the fourth century. Then most probably he saw what he writes of in one of his letters: The solitaries taking the Blessed Sacrament to their cells that they might give themselves Holy Communion in the absence of a priest—just what we learn from Tertullian of the Christians of the early third century. Among the most precious monastic records are those which tell of Daily Communion in the semi-cenobitic establishments. Evidently where this was practised there was either a daily Mass or reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. In the absence of testimonies to a daily Mass we can be sure that there was reservation as described by St. Basil. The travellers of the *Historia Monachorum* tell how they were received by the venerable Hor. He saluted them, prayed according to custom, washed their feet, read to them from the Scriptures and prayed again. "He was accustomed not to take bodily food before receiving the spiritual Communion of Christ. This received, he made his thanksgiving and began to exhort us also to

refresh ourselves." The whole context shows that he received sacramental Communion, not spiritual Communion in the modern sense. We understand the last sentence to mean that at last he thought of their dinner (it must have been late afternoon!). In fact the history goes on to say that he sat down with them and kept up an uninterrupted conversation. The Syriac version attributes this custom of daily Communion to all the great monks, and says that the travellers themselves partook of the Mysteries with their host.

Later they visited Apollo of Hermopolis. He and his monks had the same practice. They received their Communion at the ninth hour. Those who were inclined to take a meal that day engaged in spiritual conference until it was served in the evening. The more rigorous ascetics usually returned to their cells in the mountain immediately after their Communion, only remaining with their brethren for a meal on a few days of the week. In the record of Apollo's advice to his visitors we read the following: "He advised this also, that, if possible, the monks should daily communicate in the Mysteries of Christ. For he who withdraweth from these Mysteries withdraweth from God. But he who often receiveth them seemeth often to receive the Saviour Himself, who saith: 'He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my Blood abideth in me and I in him.' The very commemoration of the Lord's Passion, when the monks make it diligently, much helpeth them for an example of patience. But herewith he advised that each be found ever so prepared as to be held worthy of the Lord's Mysteries. He added that the remission of sins is given also through these Mysteries to them that believe."

Did the Egyptian monks believe without hesitation in the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist? One at least doubted. "A man of great labours and simple in the faith . . . declared that the bread which we receive is not in very truth the Body of Christ, but a similitude of His Body." "Thou must not say thus, father," two of his brethren protested, "but according to what the Holy Catholic Church hath handed down to us, even so do we believe, that is to say, this Bread is the Body of Christ in very truth, and is not a mere similitude." The old man protested his good faith, and all three agreed to pray that God would make the truth known. "And God heard the entreaty of the two fathers, and when the week was ended they came to the church, and the three of them sat down by themselves on one seat, and the old man was between the other two: and the eyes of their understandings were opened, and when the time of the Mysteries had arrived, and the bread was laid upon the holy table, there appeared to the three of them as it were a child on the table. And when the priest stretched out his hand to break the bread, behold the angel of the Lord came down from heaven with a knife in his hand, and he slew the child and pressed out his blood into the cup; and when the priest broke off from the bread small members, the old man drew nigh that he might partake of the Holy Offering, and a piece of living flesh smeared

and dripping with blood was given to him. Now when he saw this he was afraid and cried out with a loud voice, saying, 'I believe, O Lord, that the bread is Thy Body, and that the cup is Thy Blood', and straightway the flesh which was in his hand became bread like unto that of the Mystery, and he took it and gave thanks unto God. And the old men said unto him, 'God knoweth the nature of men, and that it is unable to eat living flesh, and for this reason He turneth His Body into bread, and His Blood into wine, for those who receive Him in faith.' Then they gave thanks unto God for that old man, and because He had not permitted Satan to destroy him from his labours, and the three of them went to their cells in gladness."

All that is best in the spirituality of the desert is summed up by Cassian. In the last chapter of his twenty-third Collation, speaking through the mouth of the Abbot Theonas, he describes how the proficient in virtue finds more and more in himself to blame. Then, in praise of frequent Communion and against a certain rigorism, invading perhaps his neighbouring monasteries of Gaul, he speaks words which we could well have attributed to Pius X. "But not because we see ourselves sinners should we therefore withdraw from the Lord's Communion, but more and more with desire should we hasten thereto for the healing of our soul and purifying of our spirit. Yet should we go with such humility of mind and faith that we judge ourselves unworthy to receive so great a grace, and rather seek healing for our wounds. Otherwise we ought not to think ourselves worthy even of a yearly Communion. So do some who live in monasteries and so measure the dignity, holiness and merit of the heavenly Sacraments as to reckon that they should not be received save by the holy and immaculate, whereas they should rather consider that they make us holy and pure by their being received."

JOHN MORSON, O.C.R.

NOTE.—A complete documentation encumbers the pages of a review under a regime of war economy. Some of the above is drawn from the original Greek text of Palladius's *Lausiac History* (A.D. 420), as edited by Dom Cuthbert Butler. But what is said of St. Macarius of Alexandria (not to be confused with his namesake the Egyptian) is not in this text. It is in the seventh-century Syriac version of Anan-Isho, translated by Dr. Wallis Budge, and is probably found earlier. The *Historia Monachorum*, several times quoted, is a description of travels undertaken in 394-95, written probably by Timothy, Archdeacon of Alexandria, and best known to us in the Latin version of Rufinus (Migne, P.L. xxi, 387-461). The *Questions and Answers on the Ascetic Rule* (whence is taken the story of the old man who doubted the Real Presence) are in the Syriac compilation of Anan-Isho already mentioned. They have not the *historical* value of the other documents, but they were probably first written in the fifth century and are quoted here as testifying to traditional beliefs tenaciously preserved among the Egyptian monks.

J. M.

SERMON NOTES

THE BREAD OF LIFE

THE quite inexhaustible riches of the Eucharist surely justifies another set of "Notes" on the same theme. Dr. Cartmell's admirable series in the June issue, "The Eucharist and Four Fundamental Virtues", could not be improved on, at least not by me; care has been taken not to challenge comparison with them. Rather have I selected four familiar Eucharistic texts—variants, as it seems, on the *motif* of Christ as "The Bread of Life"—and tried to suggest some relevant thoughts about them. I, II, and III provided the raw material for sermons actually preached this year at a Corpus Christi Triduum; IV has been added for the sake of completeness.

I

John vi, 35: ". . . I am the bread of life. . . ."

Important, when considering any of the sacraments, most of all the Eucharist, to pierce through the symbolic, ritualistic, liturgical, to what is historic, concrete, matter-of-fact, personal, ethical. Otherwise our thought, though picturesque, may be ineffectual and "in the air". Our Lord, here as always, is the great model. Notice how He leads up to the point that men must eat His flesh and drink His blood. The time: the Paschal season; the place: near the Lake of Galilee. The day before He had fed the 5000 from five barley loaves and two fishes, twelve baskets being left over. The onlookers vastly impressed with this, the enthusiasts wanting to make Him king. But He fled from them alone into the hills to pray. That night He again proved His mastery over the elements of nature, showing in advance, as it were, His power to change bread and wine into His very body and blood. He walked on the waters to rejoin His disciples rowing over the lake through the storm. They land at Capharnaum together. Meanwhile the crowd in their eagerness had come round the banks of the lake. The scene is very vivid: the people were puzzled to know how Jesus had already arrived, since He hadn't entered the boat with the others. Had He been using His marvellous powers again?

Jesus accuses them of seeking Him, not for His own sake, but "because you did eat of the loaves and were filled" (vi, 26). They sought Him as a mere wonder-worker, not because they were seriously prepared to listen to His teaching. Gradually He tries to lead them up to the great secret. They ask Him what they ought to do: "What shall we do, that we may work the works of God?" (vi, 28). Jewish preoccupation with "works": they fast twice a week, give tithes to the poor—is there something more of the same sort that they must do? But our Lord for the moment does not want them to *do* anything, save accept Him. BELIEVE—that is what they must do. "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent" (vi, 29). We shall never grasp Christ's teaching on the Eu-

charist unless we see it as the climax of His doctrine of faith. Even when our Lord first calls Himself "the bread of life" it would seem from the context that He is still referring to the acceptance of Him by the mind through faith rather than explicitly to His Eucharistic presence. And so it cannot but be: unless we are already united to Jesus in faith the Blessed Sacrament can have little meaning for us. Not that the Real Presence depends upon faith; not that it is any less real because men choose to disbelieve it; but because our supernatural life is rooted and grounded in faith, and accordingly the quickening of that life which the Eucharist brings presupposes faith.

Thus the belief in Christ which will make us truly appreciative of the Eucharist must be something like the faith of the first disciples. They did not simply accept with their minds certain statements *about* their Lord; it was *Himself* who counted for everything; there was nothing and nobody else. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (vi, 69). Believing in Jesus, a man partakes of His body and blood. So nourished, his faith becomes a thing of light and his spirit takes fire. May it prove that way with each of us.

II

John xiii, 34: "A new commandment I give unto you . . ."

As Baptism is the sacrament of Faith, so the Eucharist is the sacrament of Charity. To receive the Body of Christ fosters our love for God and our neighbour; but it also presupposes that love. We have no business to be kneeling at the altar steps if we are not in charity with those who kneel there with us, and with all the world besides. The words of our text were spoken by our Lord at the Last Supper, at the very moment when He gave us this Sacrament and instituted the Mass. He had with Him then His loyal and most intimate friends, the eleven faithful disciples¹ (for it seems almost certain that Judas, the betrayer, had left the room). Jesus understood them well; and they in their measure understood and loved Him. To commemorate the parting and to preserve the spirit of fellowship in Him, Christ gave His Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine. And He summed up the meaning of it all in the command to universal charity, adding: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (xiii, 35).

There is nothing sentimental about the love which is Christian charity. To treat everyone, including those who "get on your nerves", "rub you up the wrong way", with respect and good will (two fundamental constituents of charity: prosaic and unromantic, but worth any amount of tender feelings and warm emotions!) calls for gentleness, forbearance, consideration, a sense of fair play, and certainly courage; that is, for some-

¹ The different standpoints of St. John and the Synoptics leave details of the Last Supper in dispute. The view that the morsel offered to Judas was not the Eucharist, that he was not present at the consecration of the bread and wine and accordingly did not receive the Lord's Body, seems to me the more likely. But there is a weight of opinion, patristic especially, for a contrary view on each of these points. The "lesson", however, is emphasized rather than otherwise if the latter opinion is correct.

thing more stable than a mere emotional response. Love of the brotherhood—and if we are not aiming at it, what is to be said for our claim to be a Christian?—lies at a deeper level than that of “instinctive reaction” (so often the excuse for uncharity!), which is the domain of likes and dislikes. Though it is important, by the way, to control our likes and dislikes; unchecked, they lead easily to harbouring grievances, ill-temper and spitefulness, which shrivel the soul and spoil everything. Bad will is the fatal offence in the Christian; in fact the only fatal offence. To save us from it, and its consequences, Christ gave us this Sacrament. Good will—which means, first and foremost, *thinking* well of others, leading in its turn to a generous, open-hearted, unselfish, helpful and generally constructive attitude towards the world at large—is, by God’s grace, within the reach of all of us. To possess this good will, in union with Christ, who had it supremely, is what gives meaning to life, what we go to Communion for.

As for loving in this way our “enemies”, there is a moving lesson not far to seek. Judas the betrayer sat at the Last Supper table, had had his feet washed by the Master, heard the discourse on humility. But treachery was in his heart. If ever a good man was confronted with the basest of enemies it was here. Yet consider how our Lord treats with him. It was the custom for the host to show special honour or favour to one of his guests by dipping a choice morsel in the dish and handing it to him. Our Lord shows that honour and favour to the disciple He knows to be planning treachery. He makes a last appeal; His good will, His charity to Judas is unflinching to the end. Even now He allows him to go without giving him away, the beloved disciple alone being let into the secret. We know that there were two swords in that room. A word to the company and they would surely have prevented the betrayal. But Judas passes out into the night under the protecting silence of Jesus. This is the moment (perhaps exactly now) when our Lord celebrates the first Mass; in this temper of soul He gives Communion for the first time. In this temper of soul would He have us receive it.

III

I Cor. xi, 27: “. . . whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily . . .”

St. Paul’s first letter to his converts at Corinth gives us a picture of the way in which the earliest Christians celebrated the Eucharist. The people came together to a social meal; they would eat and drink in a spirit of good fellowship and, probably at the end, the solemn liturgy would be gone through, the words of consecration pronounced, and the Body and Blood of the Lord distributed to the faithful. The communal character of what we now call the Mass is brought home to us; it was something the people took part in together.

But human nature was the same in St. Paul’s day as now. Corinth was notorious for its licentiousness, and even some of the first converts from paganism were not above reproach. How could it be otherwise? Individuals came to the Eucharistic gathering and made an orgy of it; they

brought their own food, refusing to share with the needier brethren; some, it appears, drank to excess. Clearly such people had little idea of what they were about; doubtless they were not maliciously evil, they just didn't know. St. Paul tries to correct these abuses; he reminds them of what took place at the Last Supper and stresses the need for partaking of Christ's Body worthily.

His teaching has its point now as then, for us no less than for the Corinthians. We are faced with a challenge, a test not really to be avoided. If we are to lead good Christian lives we must communicate often; and yet if we are to be fit to do this we must all the while be praying and striving not to fail God, to do His will; in other words, to be in a state of grace. For we know that a sacrilegious Communion, or even a Communion gone to as a concession to public opinion, is a barren mockery of the Church's most sacred rite. If we are to use the Blessed Sacrament as the Church would have us use it we must be co-operating with God, corresponding as best we can with those graces—coming most fruitfully from the Eucharist itself—which enable us to eat this food, prepare our palates for it. If we are to be regular guests at this Feast there is demanded of us a certain restraint, self-control, a toughening of the moral fibre, a not-letting-things-go.¹

One of the many great things our Lord did was to bind together religion and morality in indissoluble union. So closely interlinked are they now that we tend, at least in thought, to identify them; but this is to oversimplify. The Greeks, as well as the more literal-minded Jews, could appreciate the value of religious ceremonial; the Jews, especially those who heeded the teaching of the prophets, and the best among the Greeks, held just and noble conduct to be of supreme importance. But they were inclined to think of ritualism and right human action as antithetical rather than complementary. Not without reason. We know that, for some at least, the celebration of the heathen "mysteries", and even the divinely sanctioned worship at the Temple in Jerusalem, could be a cloak for hypocrisy and evil living. Even today we feel that to be "religious" is not quite the same thing as to be, simply, "good"; though we should avoid the false inference from this that it is possible for a man to be, in the ultimate sense, good without also being religious.

The Eucharist was Christ's method of impregnating ritual (a desire for which is innate in the human heart) with the supreme goodness which is charity. We cannot treat Mass and Communion as an idle pageantry, at which we are detached spectators; still less as magical charms working their effects irrespective of any action of ours. We are actors in the drama, participants; and our qualifications for that role are just the love of God and our neighbour which the Eucharist both signifies and, if we fail not to correspond, produces within us. "Lord, I am not worthy . . ."; yet, in another sense, let me beware lest I "eat this bread . . . unworthily".

¹ We are apt to forget that there are virtuous, as well as vicious, circles. Here is a case in point. We partake of the Eucharist so as to be made pleasing to God; but in order to partake of it we must first be pleasing to God. The movement, however, is not monotonously circular; rather it is, or should be, an ascending spiral. (I relegate this thought to a footnote, as it might be hard—though perhaps not quite impossible—to "put it across" from the pulpit.)

IV

Luke xxii, 19: ". . . Do this for a commemoration of me."

The Reformers, in their one-sidedness, choosing to stress certain parts of the Christian revelation while neglecting others equally important, insisted that the Eucharist was a commemoration, or "memorial", of the Lord's Supper. They also had it in mind to repudiate the Catholic doctrine of the reality of the Sacrifice of the Mass. So the Church ruled out the idea of a "mere" commemoration (*nuda commemoratio*—the first being the operative word), defending and defining the traditional teaching of the substantial identity of the Mass with Calvary.

Nevertheless the Mass *is* a commemoration, or memorial—*haec quotiescumque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis*—though unique in the sense that it presents us here and now, over again, with that which we are invited to call to mind. It may help us sometimes to reflect on this aspect of it, an aspect which certainly filled the thoughts of the early Christians when they met together for the "breaking of bread". They were doing again what Christ had done with His disciples "the same night in which he was betrayed" (I Cor. xi, 23). So the words of the Canon, immediately before the Consecration, bring us back to the same solemn moment: *Qui pridie quam pateretur. . .*

It is not then fanciful to imagine ourselves as gathered round the Supper table in the company of the chosen disciples, listening to the words of the Lord, seeing His actions. We are being invited to recapture the spirit of utter devotion to Christ, and fellowship one with another, which animated that company. With them we can watch Jesus take bread into His hands, bless and break and pronounce the words which change it into His Body; likewise with the chalice . . . "of the new and eternal covenant". So, as we realize it now, with clearer eyes (for this at least) than those first witnesses, is the saving death of Christ being sacramentally re-enacted.

Could we but be aware of what we are about! Is it wrong to suppose that Christ must sometimes plead for His friends, as well as for His enemies, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"? Insensitive stupidity, it has been said, lies at the root of all the vices. Anyhow, it is certain that a great deal of uncharity is due, not so much to deliberate bad will, as to a failure to perceive; we don't recognize the one we offend as the "brother . . . for whom Christ died" (I Cor. viii, 11). What of those I walk up to the altar with? Do I in any sense look upon those with whom I kneel at the rails as Christ desired the disciples sitting with Him at table to look upon each other? Is my Communion only *mine*, an encounter, as I trust, between Christ and myself, wherewith to refresh *my* soul, for the benefit of *my* spiritual advancement? Better that, of course, than nothing; always, too, Communion must bring with it an intensification of the soul's union with God; but not, surely, as a private affair. This is the Sacrament of the Mystical Body, of the Christian fellowship, something for all to take in common. Our hearts must be enlarged by it. So they will be if we ourselves do not constrict them, by rancour, by envy, by self-assertion.

The graces of Mass and Communion come to us as God decides; "the Spirit breatheth where he will . . ." (John iii, 8); but we can dispose ourselves for them. How better than by recalling, as indeed we are bidden to do, the first Eucharist, projecting ourselves in imagination into the state of mind and heart of the disciples at the Last Supper? (A sermon on these lines might end with a translation of the Corpus Christi Collect, so familiar to the faithful from its recital at Benediction: *Deus qui nobis*. . .)

ÆLRED GRAHAM, O.S.B.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

IN attempting to write a notice of Miss Dorothy L. Sayers' *The Man Born to be King*,¹ the radio play, or more strictly series of plays, produced by the B.B.C. on various occasions between December 1941 and October of last year, one may wholeheartedly echo the words of an earlier appreciation to the effect that the book, deeply interesting as it is, "sets the reviewer a complicated task". Mr. Philip Guedalla begins his excellent paper on "Mr. Belloc: a Panorama" with the sentence: "Is it (perhaps it is) a discourtesy to tell Mr. Belloc that there are too many of him?" And without any but a passing reference to Miss Sayers as a writer of detective stories, and with every desire to concentrate uniquely upon the work in hand, one may say that, in her case, too, there are too many of her. To form any just idea of the twelve plays contained in the book it is necessary to read carefully some forty pages of introduction which explain the invitation originally given to the author in February 1940, the terms on which she accepted the proposal, her equipment for the task, the choice of an idiom which, while being at times literary and at times colloquial, would prove a safe passage-way between Wardour Street and Grub Street and, most important of all, the theological implications of this version of "The stages of one towering drama Always ahead and out of sight". Having read some twenty-five thousand words of preface, and then nearly two hundred thousand words of text, the reviewer is likely to feel that he cannot do justice to all the topics available in anything short of a pamphlet.

In claiming as she does that there were "no modern precedents to offer a guide as to treatment" (p. 17), since the law forbidding the stage representation of any Person of the Blessed Trinity had fostered the view that all such representations were evil and had "encouraged a tendency, already sufficiently widespread, towards that Docetic and totally heretical Christology which denies the full Humanity of our Lord", Miss Sayers appears to have forgotten the screen. There was, as may well be remembered, an admirable silent film, produced some time before the last war and since fitted with a sound track, entitled *From the Manger to the Cross*. In this film our Lord and His Blessed Mother frequently appeared; even the agony of the Cross was shown, though with merciful brevity.

¹ *A Play Cycle on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. London: Gollancz, 1943. Pp. 343. Price 10s. 6d. net.

As regards the language used in the dialogues, the author makes out a good case for eschewing any slavish devotion to one particular vocabulary or literary convention. She does not agree with the editor who wrote that: "In quoting the Bible we must take the Authorized Version, and not the interpretations of scholars, however wise", though his meaning may have been that it would be better, for the purposes of his newspaper, to accept one familiar, traceable source of quotation rather than to allow correspondents and others to make their own, uncontrollable versions. Here, as has been said already, there is literary and there is colloquial English, but in many passages one shades off into the other, and in the same scene there is often a marked contrast of styles. One may instance the extreme colloquialism of the housewife at Bethlehem (Scene 2, sequence 1 of the first play), with her: "Come along, lovey, aren't you a beautiful boy then?" as contrasted with the first words spoken by our Blessed Lady: "He is happy in your kind home. But when he was born, he wept." Occasionally, in spite of all the author's explanation, the jargon is too severe a trial for us, as in the scourging scene in "The Princes of this World" (Scene 5, sequence 2, p. 284), but it may well be that, as Dr. Welch wisely says in his Foreword, any shrinking on our part is due to the more or less unconscious conviction that: "*We don't want to believe* that the Crucifixion was like *that*" (p. 16).

It would be difficult to praise too highly the skill with which the author has managed to present many of the great scenes in our Lord's life in a vivid, natural, attractive and entirely truthful manner. It is perhaps to be regretted that so many of the characters introduced to us are fictitious, and that very exceptionally the atmosphere of the plays is rather that of the apocryphal gospels than that of the four evangelists. At times, too, the literary invention is a little too obvious, as in the scene at the foot of the Cross in which Mary Magdalen is obliged to sing "Soldier, soldier, why will you roam" in order to obtain standing room beside the Cross for the Holy Mother, St. John and herself. On the other hand, there are fictitious scenes which ring extraordinarily true, one example being that short but poignant episode in the governor's palace when the voices of adults and children in many accents and various tongues are heard reciting throughout the Christian centuries the tremendous words: "Suffered under Pontius Pilate".

The theology of the book is not absolutely satisfactory. One may refer to the unfortunate suggestion on p. 317 that the body of the Risen Master was not always numerically identical with the body that lay in the tomb. ("Presumably It could build Itself up from any atomic material that happened to be handy.") A reading of St. Thomas's 54th question in the third part of the *Summa Theologica*: "De qualitate Christi resurgentis", might help to dispel this illusion. Again, the statement on p. 114: "There is no need to suppose that Jesus, with his human mind, foresees certainly or in detail what Judas will do to him", will not be accepted as traditional doctrine by those familiar with that part of the treatise *De Verbo Incarnato* which is concerned with the knowledge of the God-Man. There seem to be very few material slips in the information provided. Possibly the most noticeable is that on p. 263, where Herod Antipasis said to have

been the grandson, instead of the son, of Herod the Great. But the dynasty of the Herods is admittedly complicated and recalls Macaulay's remark that even he found it difficult to learn the complete list of the Popes by heart, since he was always liable to "get lost among the Innocents". True, there were no innocents among the Herods, but there *were* a great many Herods.

The writing of lives of the chief men and women of the Bible, lives based for the most part on the Biblical data but helped out by imagination, critical insight, and extra-Biblical knowledge of Semitic life and culture, has been a fairly common practice in past years, though mostly, it would seem, on the part of non-Catholic writers. One of the best-known examples of a set of such lives was the dismally bound but none the less readable "Men of the Bible" series, in which appeared the late Professor S. R. Driver's *Isaiah: His Life and Times, and the Writings which bear his Name* (2nd edition, 1893). More recently, to mention no other instances, there have been Madame Tabouis's volumes on Solomon and Nabuchodonosor. Mr. Duff Cooper has now written a small book on *David*¹ which is, for the most part, a straightforward re-telling of the Bible story, in which imagination has played its part, and in which the portraits of individuals have been somewhat developed and elaborated. "In no case," states Mr. Cooper, "have I written anything that is in contradiction to the scriptures, and in no case have I put spoken words into the mouth of any of the characters that are not accurate quotations from the Bible" (pp. 217-18). To prepare himself for the task the author has read a number of standard authors of which there is a list at the end of the book, but he has not, apparently, read the work that of all others would have been useful to him—the late Abbé Louis Desnoyers's *Histoire du Peuple Hébreu, Tome II: Saül et David*.² This work is a good deal more than a clear and pleasantly written account of the beginning of the Hebrew monarchy. It is the book of a master of exegesis, and is based on all the best works available up to the time of the author's death on 18 October, 1928.³ It proves, among many other points, that Renan's portrait of David in his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* as "un odieux forban, cauteleux, égoïste, cruel, sans coeur et sans pitié" (the summary is by M. Desnoyers) is wholly untrustworthy.

Is Mr. Cooper's work of the same quality? It certainly is not, and he would, doubtless, be the first to disclaim that specialized erudition which, combined with a style of great charm, makes M. Desnoyers's work so impressive. He does not, for example, seem to envisage the problems connected with the sources for David's early life, and the attempts that have been made to reconcile two very different traditions, concerning which M. Desnoyers wrote: "Les deux traditions s'ignorent mutuellement, et les deux récits ne sauraient ni se superposer ni se combiner."⁴ And a

¹ London: Cape, 1943. Pp. 224. Price 10s. 6d. net.

² Paris, Picard, 1930.

³ See the short memoir by Père F. Cavallera, S.J., in Pirot's *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* t. II, coll. 431-2.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 85, n. 1. See M. Pirot's later study of the evidence in the same volume of the *Supplément au Dict. de la Bible* as that cited above, coll. 292-96. After reviewing half a dozen solutions of the problem, M. Pirot concludes: "Somme toute, aucune solution ne s'imposant, mieux vaut encore s'en tenir à l'explication traditionnelle et exposer les faits, en suivant, comme on fait d'ordinaire, l'ordre du texte massorétique."

considerable amount of imaginative reconstruction might have been spared us if the author had been rather better informed about the history and culture of the Semites. The work, however, has good qualities—clarity, an adequate narrative style, sincerity, and a refusal to follow certain radical critics in their negations and ineptitudes. The remark on II Kings (Sam.) xii, 23, that David “meant only that he must follow his little son into that dark land of shadows where there is no remembrance and whence there is no return” implies too gloomy a view regarding the dead in the Semitic religions; there was survival, and the hope of reunion does not seem to have been entirely excluded. On II Kings xviii, 9, Mr. Cooper has escaped the trap into which so many continue to fall. As M. Desnoyers puts it: “Il n’est pas exact qu’Absalom était suspendu à une branche par ses cheveux, comme on le dit ou le représente ordinairement” (p. 298, n. 1). The text makes it plain that it was his head, not his hair, that was caught in the oak. ■

Mr. Arthur Stanley is not unfairly described by the publishers of *The Bedside Bible*¹ as “the most eminent anthologist of the day”. Readers of such compilations as *The Bedside Book*, *The Testament of Man*, and *Good Company* have found them ideal companions for what are somewhat euphemistically designated as “the quiet hours”. The present work, his latest anthology, is not quite so satisfying as the earlier masterpieces, partly because the material for selection is more restricted and far better known, but chiefly because the other anthologies could, for the most part, be left to speak for themselves, whereas here there is some introductory matter that is not always very valuable, and more notes should have been added to clarify the sense.² The selections are usually well chosen, though nearly everybody will regret that some favourite passage of his has been omitted. For example, in the present case I miss many Old Testament first choices (e.g. Isaiah vii), though this is in some measure compensated by some fine extracts from Wisdom, and in the New Testament there are no passages from the Pastoral epistles, and I Cor. xi is absent. Room might also have been found for an excerpt, however short, from one or other of the Petrine epistles.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

EPISTLE AT MISSA CANTATA

At a sung Mass, without sacred ministers, when there is no tonsured cleric present, should the celebrant sing or merely recite the epistle? (W.)

¹ London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1942. Pp. viii + 258. Price 8s. 6d.

² The note to p. 65 says, incorrectly, that the meaning of II Kings v, 6, is not clear. The author might have consulted Dr. S. R. Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, where it is written: “Their fortress, they mean to say, is so strong that even the blind and the lame in it are sufficient to keep David from entering it” (p. 258).

REPLY

He may sing it or recite it at choice, following S.R.C., 23 April, 1875, n. 3350: "... quum Missa cantetur sine Ministris et nullus sit clericus inserviens qui superpelliceo indutus Epistolam decantet iuxta rubricas, satius erit quod ipsa Epistola legatur sine cantu ab ipso Celebrante: nunquam vero in Ecclesiis Monialium decanteretur ab una ex ipsis".

CHOIR OBLIGATION

The Code states that four are required for choral recitation of the Divine Office. Some, however, hold that three will suffice, others even two. The latter opinion seems based on the directions of the Code that fewer than four will suffice if the constitutions of any Institute so decide; the canonical axiom "tres faciunt collegium" appears to be set aside. May the opinion be followed that three, or even two, will suffice in all cases? (INTERESTED.)

REPLY

Canon 610, §1: In religionibus sive virorum sive mulierum, quibus est chori obligatio, in singulis domibus ubi quatuor saltem sint religiosi choro obligati et actu legitime non impediti, et etiam pauciores, si ita ferant constitutiones, debet ad normam constitutionum quotidie divinum officium communiter persolveri.

(i) The obligation will usually be settled by local custom if the constitutions do not expressly determine it, and, since the obligation is on the community, the ruling of the superior must in practice be followed. The Dominicans are bound to the choral recitation of the office even if there are only three "legitime non impediti" available. Cf. Prümmer, *Manuale Iuris Ecclesiastici*, Q. 235. Some canonists take for granted that there are particular constitutions which require the choral office even if there are only two available: Toso, *Commentaria Minora*, p. 188; Fanfani, *De Iure Religiosorum*, n. 396, quoted in *Ephem. Liturg.*, 1931, p. 67: "difficile enim est comprehensu cur Codex non tres pro "pauciores" eligeret, si tantum tres obligare voluisset".

(ii) The common law extinguishes the choir obligation if there are less than four available, and the number is to be reckoned exclusive of visitors from other houses of the same Institute. Cf. *Commentarium pro Religiosis*, 1940, p. 84. Granted that choral office is obligatory owing to four being available, the question then is whether the law of canon 610, §1, is being violated by the absence of two or even of one from choir. There are various opinions. Goyeneche, *De Religiosis*, §78: "Obligationi non videtur duobus satisfieri; satisficit certo clericis tribus et probabilius etsi sint novitii". Veermeersch-Creusen, *Epilome*, I, §768: "Non ideo tamen, contra Fanfani, n. 266, existimabimus ubique gravis chori obligatione satisfieri posse per duos qui officium psallant." Berutti, *De Religiosis*: "Quidquid vero de eorum sententia iudicetur qui docent chori obligationi legitime satisfieri etiam per duorum tantum religiosorum praesentiam in choro, certum omnino est

quod non servaretur praescriptum can. 610, §1, de officio divino *communiter* persolvendo si unus vel duo religiosi—choro obligati et actu legitime non impediti—choro non intersint eo quod duo religiosi ibidem iam adsunt qui onus communitalis legitime adimpleant.” Berutti’s interpretation seems the best. *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1921, pp. 41–67, contains a long dissertation on the whole subject, but we find the writer’s argument and meaning difficult to follow.

CONDUCT OF MARRIAGE CAUSES

What is the best work to be consulted for the conduct of marriage causes before a diocesan tribunal? One is required which gives the *formulae* likely to be necessary. (W. A.)

REPLY

(i) The procedure of a trial before diocesan tribunals is now regulated by the Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments, 15 August, 1936, and publications before this date must be used with some caution, e.g. Lanier, *Guide Pratique de la Procédure Matrimoniale* (Paris, 1927); Lyons, *Collegiate Tribunal of First Instance* (Washington, 1932); d’Angelo, *La Curia Dioecesana* (Giarre, Sicily, 1928).

In Latin the most generally useful, both for its commentary and the *formulae* supplied, is Benedetti, *Ordo Iudicialis Processus Canonici Instruendi* (Marietti, 1938). A Latin commentary on the 1936 Instruction, but with very few *formulae*, has been published by Dr. J. Torre, A Roman advocate (D’Auria, Naples, 1937).

We think that the best for English people are the works of Dr. Doheny, *Practical Manual for Marriage Cases and Canonical Procedure in Marriage Cases* (Bruce Publishing Company, New York, 1938). The first book mentioned contains the text of the Instruction with an English version and a complete set of *formulae*; the second is a fuller commentary but lacks the *formulae*.

Roman documents issued since the publication of Dr. Doheny’s books should also be born in mind. The more important are:

(a) Holy Office, 22 March, 1939 (CLERGY REVIEW, 1939, XVI, p. 553), directing that a Promotor Iustitiae may not accuse a marriage denounced by a non-Catholic, without a faculty from the Holy Office, unless in the Ordinary’s judgement the public good demands this intervention.

(b) Holy Office, 15 January, 1940 (CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 555), deciding that apostates are included under the term “acatholici” for the purposes of the law in art. 35, §3, of the 1936 Instruction.

(c) Code Commission, 27 July, 1942 (CLERGY REVIEW, 1943, XXIII, p. 90), declaring in relation to canon 1971, §1, n.1, that “causa culpabilis” means “directa et dolosa culpabilis”.

(ii) The process preliminary to a papal dissolution of a ratified non-consummated marriage is governed by the *Regulae Servandae* issued by the Congregation of the Sacraments, 7 May, 1923, together with a complete set of *formulae* (A.A.S. xv, 1923, p. 389). This has been supplemented by further *Normae*, 27 March, 1929, given as Appendix I to the Instruction of

15 August, 1936, and by the *Cautelae* issued by the Holy Office, 12 June, 1942 (CLERGY REVIEW, 1943, XXIII, p. 45).

There are also some rules, we believe, for the conduct of a diocesan process preliminary to a papal dissolution "in favorem fidei" (cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 263), but these have not been published.

VICARIUS SUBSTITUTUS AND "MISSA PRO POPULO"

A parish priest is legitimately absent for the period of the war as an Army chaplain, his place being taken, with the Ordinary's express approval, by a substitute. Is this latter priest bound to say the "Missa pro populo"? (VIC. SUB.)

REPLY

Canon 466, §1: Applicandae Missae pro populo obligatione tenetur parochus ad normam can. 339, quasi-parochus ad normam can. 306.

Canon 466, §5: Legitime absens parochus potest Missam pro populo applicare vel ipse per se in loco in quo degit, vel per sacerdotem qui eius vices gerat in paroecia.

Canon 474: Vicarius substitutus qui constituitur ad normam can. 465, §4, 5, et can. 1923, §2, locum parochi tenet in omnibus quae ad curam animarum spectant, nisi Ordinarius loci vel parochus aliquid exceperint.

(i) This obligation is one of the details which the law assumes will be settled either by the Ordinary or by the parish priest who is legitimately absent. For it is ultimately a question of the just remuneration due to the Vicarius Substitutus for his services, since he will be the poorer by the equivalent number of Mass offerings if he is bound to the "Missa pro populo". It may well be, considering the nature of our parochial benefices in this country, that the Vicarius Substitutus will have assigned for his support whatever the parish priest was himself accustomed to receive; in this case it would not be unreasonable for the absent parish priest to require his substitute to undertake, without any special remuneration, the obligation of saying these Masses. It is entirely a matter of arrangement between the two priests concerned, and the Ordinary would be well within his right in assuring himself that the obligation is being discharged by one or other of these priests.

(ii) Supposing, however, that the matter has not been expressly determined, it is the view of some canonists, based on the terms of canon 474, that the presumption is for the obligation to rest on the Vicarius Substitutus; thus Clacys-Bouuaert in *Jus Pontificium*, 1927, vii, p. 80. We do not agree with this view. The presumption more correctly is that the absent parish priest is bound by the obligation as long as he retains the right to return to his parish, and this appears to be the commoner view amongst the writers. Wernz-Vidal, II, §742: "... parochus absens poterit sibi reservare applicationem Missae pro populo, quae reservatio, attento canone 466, §5, supponenda est, nisi substituto expresse Missae applicationem commiserit". Ferreres, *Theologia Moralis*, II, §466 (1932): "Non autem per se ad id tenentur

vicarii substituti in absentia parochi aut pendente recursu contra sententiam privationis paroeciae, nisi ex conventione cum parochi aut ex dispositione Ordinarii aliud fuerit statutum." Cf. also Fanfani, *De Iure Parochorum*, §382; *Collationes Brugenses*, 1923, p. 409; 1928, p. 461.

NOMEN EPISCOPI

When should one begin to mention the name of a newly appointed bishop in the Canon of the Mass? (F. B.)

REPLY

S.R.C. 4 July, 1879, n. 3500 ad 2: An Episcopi nomen dicendum sit in Canone Missae et in aliis liturgicis orationibus a die notitiae (etiamsi haec non officialiter habeatur) electionis eiusdem in Concistorio, vel a die captae possessionis Ecclesiae cui a Summo Pontifice praepositus fuit? Resp.: A die captae possessionis vel per Episcopum ipsum, vel per suum Procuratorem.

Canon 334, §3: Canoniam dioecesis possessionem capiunt Episcopi residentiales simul ac in ipsa dioecesi vel per se vel per procuratorem apostolicas litteras Capitulo ecclesiae cathedralis ostenderint, praesente secretario Capituli vel cancellario Curiae, qui rem in acta referat.

The same principle is apparent in these texts as in the parish priest's taking possession of his parish, discussed in this journal, 1941, XXI, p. 52. Neither can exercise jurisdiction until this formality is observed. Thus, for the purpose of validly assisting at marriages, canon 1095, §1, 1, includes both bishop and parish priest under one text which asserts that this power begins from the day they have taken possession. Accordingly, until this has been done the bishop's name is not mentioned in the liturgical offices.

PETITION FOR SANATIO

Could a priest rightly apply for a *sanatio* in favour of two parties in a mixed marriage, neither of whom are subjects of the Ordinary to whom the petition will be addressed, but who are living for the time being within his territory without acquiring even a quasi-domicile therein? (B.)

REPLY

(i) If the parties have nowhere a domicile or quasi-domicile (canon 92) they are subject as *vagi* to the Ordinary of the place where they are actually staying (canon 94, §2), and the petition is lawfully presented to him, provided mention is made of any former refusal by some other Ordinary (canon 44, §1).

If the parties have elsewhere a domicile or quasi-domicile they are subjects of the Ordinaries of these places, and are *peregrini* in the place where they are actually staying (canon 91). Provided mention is made of any

former refusal, we think that a petition may lawfully be addressed to the Ordinary of this place, who will use his discretion in rejecting or granting it in accordance with the terms of his own faculties. It is, indeed, in some dispute whether the only competent Ordinary for marriage dispensations is the proper Ordinary of the parties, but it can be held with plausibility that, in principle, *peregrini* may validly and lawfully be dispensed by the Ordinary of the place in which they are staying. Cf. d'Angelo in *Apollinaris*, 1928, p. 255; Van Hove, *De Privilegiis et Dispensationibus*, n. 433; Vromant, *Normae Generales*, n. 199.

(ii) This view is supported by the terms of the quinquennial faculties which may be seen in Beste, *Introductio in Codicem* (1938), Appendix I: "Sanandi in radice matrimonia attentata coram officiali civili vel ministro acatholico a suis subditis etiam extra territorium, aut non subditis, intra limites proprii territorii. . . ." Woywod, in *Canonical Decisions of the Holy See* (1933), p. 146, gives the following English version: "To validate marriages by the *sanatio in radice*, when marriage had been attempted before a civil magistrate or a non-Catholic minister by his subjects (even if they thus married outside his diocese), or by non-subjects if they attempted marriage in his diocese. . . ." The formulae of these faculties vary in different places and it may be that the original of Woywod's version differs from the text given by Beste and others; it is clear that the English version in Woywod limits the Ordinary's power to the marriages of *peregrini* which have been attempted in his diocese. A correct version of the Latin phrase, which we believe is that contained in the formula enjoyed in this country, is given by Bouscaren, *Digest* (1936), p. 8: "To grant a *sanatio in radice* for marriages that have been attempted before a civil officer or a non-Catholic minister, either in the case of their own subjects even outside their territory, or of other persons within it. . . ."

If this interpretation is correct, the faculty in question, which is issued by the Holy Office, will have the same extent as those given by the Congregation of the Sacraments: "Ordinarius recensitis facultatibus . . . uti poterit in matrimoniis contrahendis et nulliter contractis cum suis subditis ubique commorantibus et aliis omnibus in proprio territorio actu degentibus. . . ." "Similar wording is used by the Holy Office in the faculty for dispensing (not *sanatio*) from Mixed Religion and Difference of Worship: "Dispensandi . . . cum subditis etiam extra territorium, aut non subditis intra limites proprii territorii. . . ." These are the formulae given by Beste *loc. cit.* and *Callat. Brugenses*, 1933, p. 165. There would seem to be no good reason for giving to the text issued by the Holy Office for *sanatio* a more restricted meaning than that issued for other purposes and by other Congregations; some canonists, accordingly, such as Linneborn-Wenner, *Grundriss des Eherechts* (1933), p. 165, take for granted that in each sentence the extent of the faculty is the same.

(iii) Therefore, in our view, the petition may lawfully be directed to the Ordinary of the place in which the parties are at the moment living as *peregrini*. This Ordinary may, however, take the stricter view about the meaning of his faculties; or, for any other reasons which seem to him good, he may decline to grant the petition. In this case recourse must be had, mentioning the refusal, to the proper Ordinary of the parties.

ELECTION OF VICAR CAPITULAR

Should the election of a Vicar Capitular be deferred until after the funeral of the late bishop? (R. W.)

REPLY

Canon 432, §1: Capitulum ecclesiae cathedralis, sede vacante, intra octo dies ab accepta notitia vacationis, debet Vicarium Capitularem qui loco sui dioecesis regat et, si fructuum percipiendorum ei munus incumbat, oeconomum unum vel plures fideles ac diligentes constituere.

§2.: Si Capitulum intra praescriptum tempus Vicarium aut oeconomum, quavis de causa, nullum deputaverit, deputatio ad Metropolitam devolvitur; si autem ecclesia ipsa metropolitana fuerit vacans vel metropolitana simul et suffraganeâ, ad antiquiorem ex Episcopis suffraganeis.

Canon 162, §1.: Salvis peculiaribus constitutionibus vel consuetudinibus, collegii praeses, statuto modo, loco ac tempore electoribus convenienti, convocet omnes de collegio. . . .

Conc. Prov. Westm. I, Dec. xii, n.1.: Defuncto igitur episcopo, post iusta funebria rite soluta, convenient canonici, praeside proposito, ac omnia peragent, quae a iure praescribuntur pro electione Vicarii Capitularis, quae infra octo dies locum habere debet.

In the common law of canon 432 there is no rule that the election must be deferred till after the funeral, though it is fitting that it should be. The Westminster law expressly states that the funeral must take place first, but does not make it clear whether the eight days is to be computed from the day of burial. It is certainly the correct procedure to await the funeral of the late bishop before electing a Vicar Capitular, provided the funeral is not delayed beyond eight days from the time the Chapter became informed that the See was vacant. If there is a delay of more than eight days it would appear that the election should take place before the funeral, notwithstanding the law of the Westminster Council, in order to observe the common law of canon 432, §1. Otherwise there is some danger of the Capitular election being supplanted by the Metropolitan using the right conferred upon him by canon 432, §2.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

BASILICAE MINORIS HONORIBUS DECORATUR CATHEDRALE TEMPLUM BIRMINGAMIENSIS ARCHIDIOECESIS (*A.A.S.* xxxv., 1943, p. 65).

PIUS PP. XII

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Exponendum Nobis curavit Ven. Frater Thomas Williams, Birminghamiensium Archiepiscopus, die xxi huius mensis centesimum annum feliciter impletum iri, ex quo cathedrale tem-

plum, cura et studio Vicarii Apostolici illius temporis gothica structura erectum omnibus Angliae catholicis plaudentibus et summas Deo gratias agentibus, consecratum fuit, in eoque S. Cadonis reliquiae, tunc repertae, fidelium venerationi propositae fuerunt. Cuius cathedralis templi sollemnis dedicatio an. MDCCCXLI peracta spem attulit catholicis illius nationis quam maximam fore ut ad sinum communis Matris Ecclesiae plures in dies ex popularibus redirent. Quod quidem, favente Deo, ita factum est, ut dioecesis Birminghamiensis, anno MDCCCL constituta, ad Archidioecesis Metropolitanae dignitatem et gradum anno MCMXI elevata fuerit. Nunc autem ad consecrationis anni centenarii memoriam perennandam rogavit Nos Archiepiscopus, quem diximus, ut cathedralem ecclesiam Birminghamiensem ad dignitatem Basilicae Minoris evehere dignemur. Quibus votis Nos ultro libenterque annuendum censemus ut, non solum ipsi Praesuli Metropolitano oratori gratificemur, sed etiam omnibus Dioecesis et christifidelibus Anglicae Nationis, qui urbem Birmingham, ex qua laudabilis creditus multorum ad unicum Christi ovile felix habuit initium, diligunt et venerantur; ideoque sacram aedem cathedralem eiusdem urbis merito maximi faciunt et veluti monumentum historicum Catholicae Ecclesiae habent. Quare, audito Venerabili Fratre Nostro Carolo S. R. E. Cardinali Salotti, Episcopo Praenestino, Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Praefecto, attenta commendatione Nostri Apostolici Delegati in Anglica Ditione, certa scientia ac matura deliberatione Nostri, deque Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium Litterarum tenore, perpetuumque in modum, Birminghamiensis archidioecesis cathedrale templum, ad titulum et dignitatem Basilicae Minoris evehimus cum omnibus honoribus ac privilegiis quae huiusmodi titulo de iure competunt. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Haec largimur, statuimus, decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas, atque efficaces iugiter exstare ac permanere; suosque plenos et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere; illisque ad quos spectant sive spectare poterunt, nunc et in posterum plenissime suffragari; sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum; irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri si quidquam secus, super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter sive ignoranter attentari contigerit.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris, die XI mensis Iunii, an. MCMXLI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

A. CARD. MAGLIONE, *a Secretis*.

S.R.C., 27 August, 1836, n. 2744, defined the privileges of minor basilicas: "... nomine privilegiorum, gratiarum, praecminentiarum, exemptionum, indulgentiarum ceterorumque similium, quae continentur in Litteris Apostolicis in forma Brevis expeditis favore alicuius Ecclesiae ad gradum Basilicae minoris elevatae, venire: Conopaeum, omni tamen auri et argenti ornato ab eo excluso, tintinnabulum et usum cappae magnae." The *conopaeum* is a large ceremonial article, resembling a half-opened umbrella, which is carried in front of the clergy in procession, accompanied by the ringing of a small bell—*tintinnabulum*. The use of a *palmatoria* (bugia or hand-candlestick) is not included in the above decree, but it may be granted—as well as other privileges—by special indult. The most striking privilege, applicable only to a minor basilica such as the Cathedral of Birmingham,

which has a chapter of secular canons, is their right to wear *cappa magna*. In addition, it is customary to exhibit the papal arms prominently over the main door of the basilica, and to print the same on official documents issued by the authorities of the church. Cf. *Jus Pontificium*, 1926, VI, p. 21; CLERGY REVIEW, 1939, XVII, p. 73.

(ii) LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

AD EMUM P. D. ALOYSIUM S. R. E. PRESB. CARD. MAGLIONE, A PUBLICIS ECCLESIAE NEGOTIIS: PUBLICAE SUPPLICATIONES INDICUNTUR AD POPULORUM PACEM CONCILIANDAM (*A.A.S.* xxxv, 1943, p. 103).

PIUS PP. XII

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Singulis annis, postquam saevissimi conflagratio belli per universum fere terrarum orbem exarsit, per te, mense adventante Maio, christianos omnes adhortati sumus, ac nominatim insontes pueros Nobis sane carissimos, ut, sacra inita precum contentione, a Deipara Virgine contenderent ut pacem omnibus optatissimam benigna a Deo impetraret. Quodsi interneciva haec dimicatio, quae non modo exercitus, sed pacificas etiam civitates diruit, fraternaue caede cruentat nondum conquievit, non est idcirco concidendum animo, neque a piis supplicationibus abstinendum; quin immo, quo acerbiorum cotidie increscit miseriarum cumulus, quo acrius simultatis aestus multorum inflammat animos, eo impensius precando paenitendoque ad Deum est confugiendum, qui unus potest et mentibus odio exacerbatis christianae caritatis lumen impertire, et tumescentibus pacatis fluctibus, gentes omnes ad redintegrandam concordiam revocare.

Attamen non satis est, ut probe nosti, Dei Numen exorando sibi conciliare propitium; non satis est sanctissimam Iesu Christi nostrumque omnium Matrem adiutricem sibi ac patronam suppliciter invocare; aliud etiam profecto postulat a nobis omnibus teterrimum hoc diuturnumque excidium, quod ipsa humanae societatis fundamenta concutere videtur, et ad extremam minitatur rapere ruinam universam gentium communitatem.

Imprimisque necesse est perpendant atque agnoscant omnes bellum eiusmodi, quod post conditum mundum videtur maximum, nihil aliud postremo esse, nisi meritissimam violatae divinae iustitiae poenam. Saepius enim hac nostra aetate videre est humanae mentis rationem, suis elatam viribus, debitam aeterno Numini obedientiam renuere; atque adeo homines religionem sanctissimam vel neglegere, vel omnino despectui habere; evangelicae sapientiae praecepta, quasi obsoleta adultoque saeculo indigna, respuere; ac demum eo unice contendere, ut praesens haec occiduaque vita—in oblivionem posita sempiterna—commodis, divitiis, voluptatibusque omnibus affluat. Atsi summa atque aeterna ratio repudiatur iubentis vetantisque Dei, quae reliqua potest privatos publicosque mores regere? Quae reliqua ipsius humanae consortionis principia ac normas impertire, ac firma solidaque reddere? Nulla prorsus; nam "sanctitate ac religione sublata, perturbatio vitae sequitur et magna confusio".¹

¹ Cf. Cic., *De Nat. Deor.* I, 2.

Si igitur aberratum est, ad rectum est iter remigrandum; si commendiciae doctrinae species multorum allexit obscuravitque animos, discutienda est erroris caligo luce veritatis; si denique non pauci, terrenis rebus aequo nimis distenti, christianae virtutis divinitus cultus officia sanctissima neglexere, se recollegant oportet, atque ad ea imprimis intendant vires, ad eaque operam dirigant, quae potiora sunt bona, quaeque ad vitam respectant sempiternam. Haec est communis omnibus quasi sacra ineunda contentio, quae eo enitatur, ut privati publicique mores ad Iesu Christi praecepta conformentur, eademque quam latissime in vitae usum deducantur. Hoc urgeant omnes, quibus non modo sua cordi sit salus, sed quibus etiam cordi sit ut pax, tranquillitas, prosperitas humanae societati tandem aliquando arrideant. Quodsi omnes, pro sua cuiusque virili parte, hoc peragere nitentur, tum procul dubio gratiores magisque acceptae ad Deum admovebuntur preces, ad sanctissimamque Iesu Christi Matrem.

Hisce igitur salutaribus consiliis animati, per proximum mensem peculiari modo Deiparae Virgini sacrum, eius aram adeant omnes; ac non modo deferant agorum ac viridariorum flores, non modo preces supplicationesque suas, sed emendationis etiam perfectionisque vitae propositum, quo quidem nihil est Divino Redemptori acceptius, nihil est almae eius Genitrici gratius.

Nos superiore mense Octobri Ecclesiam sanctam, mysticum Iesu Christi Corpus tot vulneribus sauciatum, itemque universum terrarum orbem, odio exarsum, discidio exacerbatum, suarumque iniquitatum luentem poenas, intaminato Beatae Virginis Cordi devovimus, commisimus, sacravimus; ac summo cum paterni animi Nostri solacio novimus eundem devotionis actum fere ubique ab Episcopis, a sacrorum ministris, et a christianae plebis multitudine fuisse renovatum. At si christiani fere omnes intermerato Mariae Virginis Cordi se ultro libenterque devoverunt, volenter itidem actuoseque eidem se conforment oportet, si reapse cupiunt ut suas preces alma Dei Genitrix benigna accipiat. Atque ita diligenter sancteque conformati non modo ii, qui in puerilis aetatis flore innocentia nitent ac gratia, sed christifideles omnes, per proximum praesertim mensem Maium a caelesti Matre iteratis enixis precibus impetrent ut in hominum animis, simulate restincta, fraterna caritas triumphet ac vigeat; ut vitiis virtutes, armis iustitia, effrenataeque violentiae serenae mentis ratio concedant; utque tandem aliquando, saevientis huius tempestatis voluminibus pacatis, gentes omnes ad pacem, ad concordiam, ad Christum redeant, qui unus potest, superna doctrina sua falli nescia, civilis consortionis fundamenta firma solidaque reddere, quique unus "verba vitae aeternae habet".¹

Multum Nos sacrae huic precum contentioni confidimus; atque adeo hoc etiam anno gratum tibi munus, Dilecte Fili Noster, concedimus paterna haec hortamenta Nostra, aptiore quo duxeris modo, cum omnibus communicandi, imprimisque cum sacris totius catholici orbis Pastoribus, quibus profecto curae erit et rem demandatis sibi gregibus diligenter proponere, et ad effectum stuidiosissime deducere.

Interea vero, caelestium gratiarum auspicem paternaeque benevolentiae Nostrae testem, cum tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, tum iis omnibus, qui hortativis hisce litteris libenti volentique respondebunt animo, ac nomi-

¹ Cf. IOAN., VI, 69.

natim carissimorum Nobis puerorum turmis, Apostolicam Benedictionem amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis Aprilis, anno MDCCCXXXIII, Pontificatus Nostri quinto.

(iii) SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

(OFFICIUM DE INDULGENTIIS)

DECRETUM ORATIO AD SANCTISSIMAM TRINITATEM INDULGENTIIS
DITATUR (*A.A.S.* xxxv, 1943, p. 92).

Ssmus D. N. Pius div. Prov. Pp. XII, in audientia infra scripto Cardinali Paenitentiario Maiori die 6 Februarii c. a. concessa, omnibus christifidelibus benigne largiri dignatus est partialem trecentorum dierum Indulgentiam toties lucranda quoties orationem "*Sanctissima Trinitas, adoramus te et per Mariam rogamus te. Da omnibus unitatem in fide eamque fideliter confitendi animum*" saltem corde contrito recitaverint et plenariam suetis conditionibus semel in mense acquirendam, si quotidie per integrum mensem eandem recitationem persolverint.

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Apostolicarum Litterarum in forma brevi expeditione et contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, e S. Paenitentiaria Apostolica, die 9 Februarii 1943.
N. CARD. CANALI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Huguenots. Fighters for God and Human Freedom. By Otto Zoff. Demy 8vo. Pp. vii + 340. (George Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

THIS book is the work of a Czech historian now living in America, and its sub-title is a sufficiently clear indication of the author's attitude to the French religious wars in the sixteenth century, and to the contribution which the Huguenots made to the history of religious toleration. There is a strong though subdued anti-Catholic strain running through the book, which has, however, considerable value for two reasons. In the first place it deals with persons rather than with processes, and is in consequence much more vivid in treatment than most books which deal with this subject. The great figures on both sides, Condé, Coligny, Catherine, the Guises, Henry of Navarre, are all skilfully if somewhat sketchily portrayed, and the same is true of most of the lesser characters. The author has the happy ability to be able to build up a neat compact thumbnail sketch, seizing on a point of appearance or character which makes the whole presentation vivid and memorable. In this respect, too, he has been well served by his translators, who have done a very capable piece of work. There is a second

reason why the book should be valuable. It brings out very clearly the place of politics and of political ambition in the tragic story of the French "religious" wars. The early generations of Huguenots may have been single-minded enthusiasts for the new gospel, but it was not long before other and less worthy influences began to play their part. The influence of Calvinism—or at any rate the Calvinism of the second generation—was not without its importance in the establishment of many of the great French industrial centres, and of commercial and industrial activity in the New World.

There are several points, mostly incidental, on which the author seems to hold views which are now a little out of date. He is, by implication at least, unjust to Pope Gregory XIII over the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and his account of the growth of vagrancy and poverty in Elizabethan England suggests too simple an answer to a complicated problem. Yet, in spite of these minor faults, and of the whole purpose of the book in defending the Huguenots, this engaging story is not without its value. What it misses is the wider tragedy of European disruption which followed inevitably from these religious wars.

A. B.

The English Carmelites. By Lancelot C. Sheppard. Crown 8vo. Pp. viii + 115. (Burns Oates. 6s.).

WITHIN the compass of a small book Mr. Sheppard has succeeded in compressing a great deal of historical knowledge and valuable information on the origin, development, dissolution and re-establishment of the Carmelite Order in England. His book is full of interest, written in an easy style which carries lightly a considerable wealth of scholarship, and must lead every reader to hope that he will undertake a fuller and more ambitious history of the Order.

Whatever may be the truth about their foundation and early history, so far as this country is concerned the Carmelites arrived from the Holy Land in December 1241, and began their first foundations almost at once. In 1247 the first General Chapter of the Order to be held in the West met at Aylesford, in Kent, one of the earliest foundations, if not the earliest. Here the English friar, Simon Stock, was elected Prior General, and his influence must have had much to do with the rapid progress made by the Order in the years immediately following the Chapter. Cambridge (1249), London (1253), York (1255), Oxford (1256) give some idea of the speed and importance of the Carmelite expansion. Intellectual influence followed less rapidly, and it was not until the fourteenth century that the Carmelites made any mark in the world of the Universities. John Walsingham, John Baconthorpe and Thomas Netter de Walden are well enough known, and the last-named was the most outstanding of a big group who did much to bring about the condemnation of Wiclif. That was to some extent the peak of Carmelite achievement, and the fifteenth century saw the beginnings of decline. Whatever observance may have been like, numbers certainly fell, and the Carmelite story at the Dissolution is one of sad submission unrelieved by any great heroism. Mr. Sheppard devotes a chapter to the reform inspired by St. Teresa, and most of his story in the modern age is an account of

the establishment and development of the Discalced Carmelites, notably the remarkable growth of the convents of Carmelite Nuns in recent times. He has a short account of the Carmelite liturgy, and a most valuable and helpful chapter on "The Spirit of the Carmelite Order". Friends and admirers of the Carmelites will give a hearty welcome to this model account of the development, work and spirit of a great Order.

A. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

MASS WITHOUT ALTAR STONE

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1943, XXIII, p. 321)

Dr. W. Denning writes:

Fr. M. de la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei*, Elucidatio xiii, last note (ed. 1921, p. 164), fully supports the opinion of Fr. Wouters, mentioned in (iii) of the above reply, and shows that the opinion of most manualists, which permits Mass without an altar stone only in the direst kind of necessity, is far too rigid.

As regards papal indults, de la Taille mentions that given by Pius IX to certain priests deported to Siberia, permitting Mass "soit sur une table ordinaire, soit sur une pierre ou un tronc d'arbre. . . ."

In more recent times there are the faculties given to the Ordinaries of Mexico in 1929, mentioned by Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II, pp. 86 and 88, permitting the celebration of Mass in extreme necessity without an altar stone.

Canon Mahoney observes:

Fr. de la Taille's note is most valuable, and I agree that the teaching of the manualists given in (ii) of the above reply is far too rigid.

Bouscaren bases his information on a mention of these faculties in Mexico given in the CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XI (IX is an error), p. 342, and I am grateful to Dr. Denning for being reminded of them. The full text as printed in the review *Christus*, 1936, p. 6, is as follows: "III. Indulgetur Ordinariis locorum ut in praedicto extremae necessitatis casu, pro asserendis SS. Speciebus, per viaticum aegrotis seu moribundis ministrandis liceat eisdem Ordinariis Sacrum facere, aut sacerdoti permittere ut Idem faciat, adhibitis pro ss. paramentis saltem superpelliceo benedicto ac benedicendo, ac stola, si ista commodè haberi possit; et in loco altaris sacrae, uti liceat lineo panno rite benedicendo et in profanos usus non amplius convertendo, super quo, ante Crucifixi imaginem cum duobus luminariis si haberi possint, SS. Species conficiantur et deponantur, servatis Missalis Romani ritu et caeremoniis saltem in parte substantiali."

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

the
He
pful
f the
elop-
THE
F
ar
still b
Press
refere
Repor
with
featur
e (ed
admi
ed in
eason
alists
est, e
nd of
rigore
many
as IX
table
altern
ies o
ever
6 and
the
ut an
becau
ind s
suffer
many
ching
a recu
Gove
es for
ghtin
2, and
proble
ll ten
lgetu
inertia
asser
Th
randis
reflec
Iden
count
to au
matte
ris se
are ab
mplis
The p
nariu
an atr
fissals
amon
appea
vades
disting
bomb
the fa
Vol